

The Nation.

NEW YORK, THURSDAY, SEPTEMBER 7, 1871.

The Week.

THE meeting to discuss the financial abuses in the city government was held on Monday evening, and was very crowded and enthusiastic. The most striking speech of the evening was that of Mr. Ottendorfer, the German editor, who spoke a very uncommon amount of good sense about municipal affairs, but was evidently apprehensive lest his appearance should be taken as a sign of adhesion to the Republican party. It is quite plain that nothing can be done against the Ring except by a coalition of Democrats and Republicans for this purpose, and it will be impossible to bring this about without the rigid avoidance by Republican conventions of all attempts to treat the Ring frauds as ammunition for use against the Democratic party. It may be hard to do this, but we earnestly beseech the managers to try it for once. It will matter little to most of us who rules at Washington if Hall and Tweed take all our earnings and accumulations. A committee of seventy was appointed by the meeting, whose business it will be to find out what ought to be done next, and it is well composed, or rather would be, if there were not so many Republicans on it. What can be done next is, for reasons we have given elsewhere, a knotty question. But one thing can certainly be done, and that is, get a majority in the Legislature sufficient to repeal the charter, and put the Ring out of office. We doubt if more than this can be done at present.

The committee of seventy which the meeting appointed to see what can be done, and to do it, have already begun operations. Very nearly half of them—a promising number, considering how such committees are appointed—met yesterday at an office in Nassau Street, and went to work in what seems, on the whole, a sufficiently businesslike manner. It agreed to call itself by the long name of "The Executive Committee of Citizens and Taxpayers for the Financial Reform of the City and County of New York," and it chose Mr. Henry G. Stebbins for its chairman. But it appointed an assistant-secretary on a salary—Mr. Roswell D. Hatch being the nominal secretary; it resolved on a Committee of Ways and Means; and it encouraged Mr. John Foley—and will doubtless back its encouragement with money—to bring the suit against the city authorities for which he some time since had the papers prepared. Mr. Foley will at least demonstrate how much legal measures in our Courts can help us—or else how little. His first move is to be made before his honor Judge George G. Barnard, and to see it made before that jurist will be as good as a play.

The *World*, we are sorry to see, was a good deal shocked by our views on a Vigilance Committee, *à propos* of Hall, Connolly & Co., expressed last week, and seems to think we desire to see these gentlemen "lynched." "Lynching" is, however, here a question-begging term. What we say is, that in our opinion Hall, Connolly, Tweed, Barnard, and all the class to which they belong, and of which Louis Napoleon was the most conspicuous member, fear no penalty for their misdeeds except a violent death. They are indifferent to public opinion, and have matters so arranged that the penitentiary has no terrors for them, and a natural death they calculate on. But the prospect of a violent death, which would suddenly stop their champagne, knock the satin sofas from under them, shut out the velvet carpets from their view, cause their fast horses to vanish into thin air, and launch them into the cold unknown, would terrify them exceedingly, and such a death, we repeat, a large and growing body of respectable citizens think they ought to die, first and foremost, in order to stop

their thieving and rid the community of them; and, secondly, to prevent the unwholesome influence on public and private morals of the spectacle of the peaceful close of their career in the enjoyment of their stealings. The way in which good citizens justify this view of their deserts is the way in which they justify all revolts against unsupportable tyranny, and all inflictions of punishment on persons who have grossly abused power for the injury of their fellow-citizens, and against whom the law affords no redress. But where they err, in our opinion, is in supposing that justice can be done on Hall and his associates through what is commonly called "a vigilance committee." An appeal to force in New York would mean civil war; and those who talk of appealing to force must make up their minds to civil war, and must be prepared for some fighting. Should they succeed in securing the persons of the malefactors, and in bringing them to punishment, their act, however, will be no more lynching than the execution of Robespierre and Rigault was lynching. It might be called high-handed, or cruel, or remorseless, or various other things, but it would have in it a solemnity which in lynch law is wanting.

The Butler campaign in Massachusetts is, owing to the increasing recklessness of the great chief himself, ceasing to be even amusing. After the invention of the falsehood about General Hawley in Springfield, and seeing it "nailed to the counter," as the *Tribune* says, almost as soon as uttered, the good man went off sadly to Worcester, where he resolved to try his luck again, and invented two more falsehoods—one fixing the date, on which he removed Hawley for incompetency, and the other declaring that General Alonzo Alden had written to him, telling him that, had it been known that Hawley was hostile to Butler, he (Hawley) would never have been elected president of the Association of the Army of the James. Whereupon comes the remorseless Hawley, and shows that at the period at which Butler says he removed him, he (Butler) had been for one fortnight at his home in Lowell in disgrace, and General Ord in command; and then comes Alden also, and declares that he never wrote a word to Butler about Hawley. This does not leave "the Christian statesman" in a worse position than he was in before, but it makes it somewhat more awkward for his friends. What does the Reverend Doctor Marvin say now about the Boston "Christians" who are all to vote for him for the governorship, in order to get rid of rum? What does the Doctor think Christ would say, were he on earth, if the Doctor were to bring Butler up some fine morning, hot from a lying speech, and recommend him for employment as a "useful" disciple? We do not like to seem irreverent or hurt anybody's feelings, but does not the Doctor really believe "the whip of small cords" would be brought into play to sharpen both his own moral sense and Butler's?

The Republicans in Pennsylvania are in nearly as much trouble as their brethren in Massachusetts. In 1867, the Legislature passed a joint resolution to the effect that the United States was supposed to be in debt to the State; that their accounting officers, however, disallowed her claims; that a special agent should be sent to put in further evidence concerning them; and that his pay for his services should be a commission, not to exceed ten per cent. of all sums collected. It seems to have been supposed by the Legislature that the sums due were comparatively insignificant. Others, however, knew better; and on the day after the passage of the resolution Governor Geary had sent greeting to a Mr. George Evans, and made him the special agent provided for. Mr. Evans found two bondsmen in \$5,000 each, and then he signed a certain agreement with the Governor, in which he stipulated to make, on oath, frequent official reports, and to pay over, "less the rate of compensation," all moneys collected by him. The rate of compensation was not mentioned. This agreement Governor Geary did not put on file, and it was not till four years after the first collection had been made that Mr. Evans made any report of his stewardship. It was not till after something else, either. Mr. Joseph McClure, Deputy Attorney-General, last month became satisfied that there was something

wrong about the proceedings of Mr. Evans, and, pursuing his investigations, discovered, or was the means of the discovery, in substance, that the sums collected by Evans—or, rather, on which he got his commission—were not insignificant, but large, being close upon \$3,000,000; that on about \$1,300,000 of this sum he had as much right to a commission as the man in the moon; that the commission paid him was the very maximum allowed by the joint resolution; that it had been set without the knowledge of the financial officers of the State; that it had been paid Mr. Evans by Mr. Evans himself, without any auditing of his accounts by anybody, or any exhibition of vouchers that he had done any work, or, if so, how much; that some of the treasury warrants, amounting in all to about \$300,000, he never paid to the State treasurer at all, whether with his commission deducted or not deducted; that he coolly put it into his pocket, as representing his commission on sums yet to be collected; that regular reports he had never made; and, finally, that Governor Geary had never alluded to all these transactions in any of his public messages.

When public attention was called to Mr. Evans, Governor Geary assured the newspaper correspondents that Mr. Evans was "a most satisfactory agent," and sent word to Attorney-General F. O. Brewster that his deputy, Mr. McClure, must resign; he had used his official position to get from the United States Treasury and the Pennsylvania Departments official documents with a view to publication. As a matter of fact, Mr. McClure seems to have at once called the attention of the State auditor and the cashier of the State Treasury to the evidences of peculation. This was on the 8th; on the 10th he went to Philadelphia in search of his superior officer, Mr. Brewster, and on the 11th found him at Atlantic City, and gave the law-officer of the State the benefit of his discovery, at the same time telling Mr. Brewster that from what Geary had said when he knew that he (McClure) was investigating the affair, the Governor would demand his removal. He has been removed, but Governor Geary has been compelled to issue his requisition on Governor Hoffman for the delivery of Evans to Pennsylvania officers, the financial officers of that State having taken out both a civil and a criminal warrant against him—suit having been brought for the recovery of the three hundred thousand, and against Evans for embezzlement, and he having disappeared from Philadelphia. Whether he and his partners, whoever they may be, will be punished and made to disgorge may perhaps be doubted; moral guilt and legal sharp practice may turn out to be the worst that can be made of what they have done; but there is no doubt that the Republicans in Pennsylvania are not at present particularly proud of their Governor. Nobody ever charged the Pennsylvania Legislature with being more intelligent or more virtuous than ours at Albany; but the average Pennsylvanian voter has a very definite notion of the size and weight of a dollar—especially of a dollar of taxation, and his freshened sense of it will very probably be felt in October. For the moment, of course, the Pennsylvania Democrats for their parts have a detestation of crimes, and in particular of crimes against property, and public property, that would be creditable in Aristides or William Wilberforce. It really seems a little hard to have to choose between the Republican Evanses and Gearys and the Democratic Connollys. Mrs. Woodhull and her friends must make haste, or our politics will be past purification before they begin voting at all.

The condition of politics in this State is somewhat perplexing, and not altogether encouraging. There are still the two factions or "gangs" in the Republican ranks, though their dissensions are kept out of view somewhat better than they used to be. One is headed, if it can be said to have a head, by Horace Greeley, and is opposed to Grant's renomination, and contains a considerable body of what are known as "Tammany Republicans." The others, who are designated by the irreverent as "the Custom-house faction," are led on by Collector Murphy and Senator Conkling, and are devoted to the Administration. Whether they will be able to patch up their differences in time either for the State election or the Presidential election, it would take a wise

man to say. Mr. Conkling, whose successor is to be chosen by the Legislature to be elected this fall, is evidently not going to stand in the way of harmony, though he is an out-and-out Grant-man. He has written a letter on the situation to Mr. Griswold, of Troy, which is as edifying as anything we remember to have read for a long time. He is in favor of "a long pull, a strong pull, and a pull altogether," he says. He speaks most contemptuously of "loaves and fishes," and thinks foul scorn of the Republican who, in a campaign like that before us, would be affected by such considerations, or who would "plot against creed or cause because the offices are too few to go around." Perish the thought! "Satan," he thinks, "cannot entrap men with so coarse and bad a snare as this." Perhaps not, but Satan is very smart. Mr. Conkling is heartily for Grant, and is deeply afflicted by the spectacle of Democratic misrule in this city. He says the rascals "infest our chief city, disgrace humanity, and mildew the commonwealth by their pestilential profligacy," which shows Hall, Connolly, and Tweed to be worse than we thought them—"mildewing the commonwealth" being a new and, we may safely say, unheard-of outrage. So Mr. Conkling is in favor of nominating and electing the best men in the Republican party for office, and he is astonished that, under the circumstances, "men should stand talking about Federal patronage, and differences among leaders, and personal feeling among individuals and the like. What have such things," he passionately asks, "to do with the duty of the hour? It is high time," he adds, "to be done with unprofitable things, signifying nothing, and only productive of harm"—an opinion in which all good citizens will cordially concur. In short, when we read Mr. Conkling's views, and remember that he has not stood particularly high as a party politician, we are a good deal puzzled by the present low condition of humanity. When such sentiments reign in such breasts, how comes it that man is not better off?

A Maine paper has been charging Speaker Blaine with the possession of "enormous wealth, acquired through his connection with public affairs"; and the *World* of this city has made it the subject of an editorial article, in which, however, it graciously concedes that the possession of great wealth does not necessarily prove dishonest acquisition in his case any more than in Mr. Tweed's (Tweed of the Ring). This has provoked Mr. Blaine into doing what we must call an ill-advised thing—namely, denying the existence of a large portion of the possessions attributed to him, and indicating what the real extent of his fortune is, and from what source he derives it, and mentioning the real value and cost, and his real reason for owning a house in Washington, called by his tormentors a "princely residence." It is, undoubtedly, hard to remain silent under charges of this kind, in the existing condition of the newspaper press; but every man can tell readily whether his reputation can bear letting them go unnoticed, and Mr. Blaine need certainly have had no doubt on this point. Nobody really questions his integrity, and nobody but a blackguard would publicly pretend that he questioned it by an inquisition into Mr. Blaine's private affairs. He might, therefore, have remained silent with perfect impunity, and he owed it to the community to remain silent for two reasons; one is, that the making such attacks has the same effect on the men who make them as the taste of blood on tigers; and the other is, that the spectacle of men as strong as Mr. Blaine flying before them naturally alarms thousands of others, of whom political life would be the better, but to whom no life would be tolerable in which a man was compelled to exhibit his ledger and check-book whenever called on by a rascally reporter.

General business has been fairly active during the week. The fall trade commences early, the Southern and Southwestern buyers being noticeable for their numbers, the prudence of their purchases, and the steady improvement in the average quality of the goods required. The importations of every description are simply enormous, largely exceeding those of any previous period of our history, and clearly marking the extravagant extent to which we have devoted our labor to railroad building and other not actually productive pursuits. The

great staples have been active, with some fluctuations in price and large exports, limited only by the number and size of vessels at the disposal of shippers. The shipping trade has greatly improved under the advance in freights, but, unfortunately, our tariff has left us no American ships to profit by it. Crop accounts continue fairly favorable with us, and rather unfavorable abroad, with pretty firm prices for breadstuffs. Groceries are scarce, and continue to advance. Coal, under the fear of a repetition of last year's strike, and the very general laying-in of winter supplies by the wealthy, has slightly advanced. Real estate is more active, in a somewhat spasmodic fashion, and without a steady market for any kind of property except medium sized city dwellings in choice localities for actual use, and unimproved land in the northern suburbs for speculation. Building continues with a fair degree of activity.

The success of the so-called new loan, the uncommonly favorable debt statement on the 1st of September, and the uninterrupted ease in the money market, have materially aided the Wall Street speculators for higher prices, and stocks have had a decided advance. But the movement is confined almost exclusively to the professional operators, and the public seems indisposed to participate. Gold is firm, partly owing to speculative movements and partly from the inevitable influence of our extraordinary importations. There are not wanting experienced financiers who look with anxiety upon the artificial and complicated arrangements of the Syndicate as likely at any moment to involve the financial community in some unforeseen difficulty. Government bonds continue to advance, and great but not altogether successful efforts are being made to create a demand for the numerous railroad loans still pressing upon the market. The banks still persist in their career of expansion, and seem unable to profit by the experience of the past. There has been a great change in the character of the country's business during the last two years, and the immense gains of "finance" are shrinking to more legitimate proportions.

The principal debate on the prolongation of the powers of M. Thiers—or, as it would be perhaps more proper to say, on the extension of the powers of the National Assembly—took place on Wednesday, August 30, amid uncommon excitement on the part of the deputies, as well as of the crowded galleries. The reporter of the special committee, who, to judge by one of the very unsatisfactory Cable despatches, may not have been M. Rivet, the mover of the original proposition, but old M. Vitet, announced that the committee had agreed to receive Minister Dufaure's amendment, expressive of confidence in M. Thiers's patriotism and wisdom; and to this the corresponding announcement was made that the Government was ready to accept the decree. Thus a compromise was effected between the majority of the Assembly and the Chief of the Executive, which saved the prestige, and, for an indefinite period, continued the power, of the latter, but, in reality, subjected him more formally than he had ever been to the authority of the Assembly, whose constituent rights, embodied in the preamble of the decree, he now acknowledged. And by thus resigning the chance of appealing, with the Left, to the people and the decision of a new and uncontested constituent assembly, M. Thiers had made a momentous change of base, which his former supporters of the more pronounced Republican ranks violently protested against, at the same time withdrawing several amendments prepared in his favor. These opponents, however, and among them Gambetta in a highly impassioned speech, vainly endeavored to combat the obnoxious first part of the preamble, which, after a most uproarious and violent discussion, was adopted by 433 yeas to 227 nays.

The Conservatives were charmed with the result, which, of course, had been decided by the Centre, but their leading organs were wise enough to promise the support of the majority to M. Thiers's own policy, which under the altered circumstances ceased to menace a sudden triumph of radicalism through his connivance. The Radical deputies were exasperated to the highest pitch, and for a moment their

resignation in a body appeared probable, but more moderate counsels seem to have prevailed. They took part in the discussions of the following day, August 31, when, after some exhortations to harmony, the remainder of the preamble and the decree proper were adopted, including M. Dufaure's paragraph in eulogy of M. Thiers, which was voted against by only thirty-four members, while "one hundred abstained from voting." Whether these hundred were all or mostly men of the Extreme Right, or, on the contrary, Radicals still meditating resignation and grumbling at M. Thiers for his submitting to the usurpation of the majority, we are not told. "President" Thiers was felicitated by the representatives of the foreign powers on assuming his new dignity. In consequence of the change, the members of his Ministry resigned, but only *pro forma*, resuming their portfolios at his request. The Minister of Finance was happy to announce that the third half-milliard installment of the war indemnity had been paid to the Germans, who, in consequence, are bound to evacuate the Departments of Seine—including the Paris forts—Seine-et-Oise, Seine-et-Marne, and Oise.

The trial of the eighteen members of the Commune or of the Central Committee arraigned before the Versailles court-martial—"troisième Conseil de Guerre"—has come to an end, excepting only the case of Lisbonne, delayed on account of the ill health of the accused. Ferré, a heartless and cynical *amateur* terrorist, of 29 years of age, and Lullier, a half-crazy would-be dictator of 31, are condemned to death; Urbain, a selfish and fierce insurrectionist, of 34, and Trinquet, an equally fierce but sincerely fanatical one, to imprisonment for life; Assi, a conceited and bold "International" conspirator, of 30, Grousset, a vain but rather gentlemanly Bohemian, of the same age, Régère, Billioray, Verdure, and Ferrat, to deportation and confinement in a fortress—for how long we are not informed; Jourde, the youngest and by far the ablest and most respectable of all, and Rastoul, like Jourde, a medical man, to simple deportation; Courbet, a weak-minded Republican, who would rather decapitate bad artistic monuments than the worst of royalists, to six months' imprisonment; Clément, a noble-hearted plebeian, to three months' imprisonment. Descamps and Parent, quite insignificant persons, are acquitted. The presiding officer, Colonel Merlin, deserves all credit for the fairness and strict judicial decorum with which he conducted the trial. Of the accused, Ferré showed himself shockingly impudent; Lullier, stupidly boastful; Assi and Trinquet, defiant; Grousset, frank; but most others did their best to escape a rigorous sentence through denials, extenuating evidence, and a frequently-displayed abhorrence of the crimes imputed to them.

It is now admitted on all hands that the meeting of Kaisers William and Francis Joseph at Ischl, and the subsequent one of Chancellors Bismarck and Beust at Gastein—in the presence of the Emperor of Germany alone—have been productive of diplomatic results calculated to ensure a harmonious action on the part of the two empires on the most important questions of Central and Eastern Europe; and that the cordial understanding already arrived at is to be made more explicit and firm at a new imperial interview, at Salzburg, where Francis Joseph is just now expected, in company of Beust and the two premiers of Austro-Hungary, Hohenwart and Andrassy. Whether Italy, more or less secretly, has or has not had a share in the preliminary agreements, or whether she is to have any in those now preparing, the despatches received here are not distinct enough to let us know. Thus much, however, seems certain, that the negotiations are highly distasteful to both Russia and France, and especially to the former, who must be horrified to see Bismarck lend a friendly arm to Austria, and secure her peace, at the very moment at which she extends the autonomy and national rights of her Polish province, and attempts to satisfy the Czechs, in order to make them renounce their affiliations with Pan Slavism and leanings towards Moscow. It is, however, quite possible that a partial abandonment of this attempt will follow, or even precede as a condition, the completion of the agreement with Germany.

A TREASURY VIEW OF THE FINANCES.

It has been often remarked, and with no little truth, that a considerable part of the present strength of the Republican party is due to the weakness and inability of the Democrats to perceive and take advantage of the blunders and mistakes of their opponents. How much longer this will continue to be the case is an open question; but there certainly can be no question that it is not politic for the Republican party, through its representative men, to take positions in partisan discussions which are wholly untenable, and which, sooner or later, from their inability to sustain criticism, must be abandoned. Of such a character, it seems to us, was much of the recent financial speech delivered at Sandusky, Ohio, by Hon. Columbus Delano, who, from having been for a time Commissioner of Internal Revenue, may be supposed to know something of what he was talking about.

Mr. Delano, in the outset, starts with the proposition that during the fiscal year of 1868, when the last Administration exercised full executive power, the total receipts from the internal revenue were \$191,000,000; but that during the first entire fiscal year of the present Administration, notwithstanding a reduction of taxation, since 1868, of seventy-eight millions of dollars, the receipts were \$185,000,000; and he claims that this remarkable gain was due almost exclusively to a more honest and efficient execution of the laws.

Unfortunately for Mr. Delano, the facts do not sustain his theory. Let us see. During the fiscal year ending June 30, 1868, the internal revenue receipts were \$191,000,000; but, during this year, taxes amounting in the aggregate, according to Mr. Delano, to over seventy-eight millions, were abated. In one single item, the reduction in the taxes on manufactures and products amounted to fifty-eight and a half millions in the receipts for the fiscal year, 1869, as compared with the receipts for the preceding year; and yet, notwithstanding this and other reductions, the total receipts for the fiscal year 1869 amounted to \$160,000,000, or a falling-off of only \$31,000,000. That Mr. Delano, however, is not entitled to claim for the Grant Administration the credit of this result, is shown by the fact that the first eight months of this fiscal year (1869) were under the Johnson Administration, while during the remaining four the Grant Administration exerted little other than a disturbing influence through the extensive removals and changes of officials, and had not had time to put the new machinery effectually in motion. During the next fiscal year, or from July 1, 1869, to June 30, 1870, the new administration had full control, and the revenues increased during that year to the extent of twenty-five millions, or from \$160,000,000 in 1868-9 to \$185,000,000 in 1869-70, and that, too, without any new abatement of taxes: so that if we attribute the increase in both instances to efficiency of administration, the balance remains in favor of the last fiscal year of the Johnson Administration, by the difference between forty-eight millions, the gain in 1868-9, and twenty-five millions, the gain in 1869-70.

But the fact is, the gain in neither of these years was due to efficiency in personal administration, but to other causes, for which neither party is entitled to claim especial credit.

In the first place, it has been noticed as one of the fiscal phenomena of our recent experience, that from the passage of the very first bill reducing internal revenue taxes in 1866 down to the present year, in no case has the revenue for the succeeding twelve months declined to an amount equivalent to the receipts from the abandoned taxes during the twelve months immediately preceding the reduction—a result which may be in part attributed to the natural elasticity of the revenues, increased by every stimulus given to production and consumption consequent upon relief from burdens; and in part, also, to a discontinuance of the frauds which were contingent upon the levying of high taxes. Ex-Commissioner Wells has shown that this natural elasticity has, since 1865, amounted to at least ten millions per annum, while in Great Britain, according to Mr. Gladstone, the average annual increase for a series of years has been in excess of eight millions.

Secondly, Mr. Delano, and others who have recently discussed this subject, overlook or ignore the fact that the major portion of the increase of revenue in 1868-9, and also in 1869-70, following the large reduction of taxes in 1868, was clearly and unmistakably due to the reduction of the taxes on distilled spirits and tobacco, and

to the new methods instituted by which the reduced taxes on these articles were assessed and collected. Mr. Delano, in his remarks, seems to desire to convey the idea that these reduced taxes were the work of the present Administration, for he says: "During the year 1868, in which the last Administration exercised full executive power, with an excise of two dollars per gallon upon spirits, of forty cents per pound upon tobacco," the entire receipts were \$191,000,000. But the truth is, that the great reductions on whiskey and tobacco were all made under the Johnson Administration, nearly four months before the election of Gen. Grant, and more than seven months before his inauguration; and the increase in revenue from both of these sources began to be experienced from the very day that the new law went into operation. For the fiscal year 1868-9, eight months Johnson and four months Grant, but practically, as we have just shown, all Johnson, the increase on distilled spirits was from eighteen to forty-five millions; on tobacco, from eighteen to twenty-three; and on sales, mainly liquors, from four to eight—making a total gain of thirty-six millions from these items alone. During the next fiscal year, 1869-70—all Grant—the increase on spirits was ten millions; on tobacco, eight; and on sales, six hundred thousand; or a total of less than nineteen millions, which sum represents all the gain in internal revenue during the first full fiscal year of the Grant and Delano Administration, with the exception of about six millions, which last may be fairly set down to the credit of natural elasticity rather than personal efficiency. In short, nearly the whole credit of internal revenue gain for the last two years, so far as personality is concerned, is due to Ex-Commissioner Wells, who first proposed and demonstrated the expediency of these reductions, and to Mr. Wells and District-Attorney Tracey, of Brooklyn, who devised the plans and essentially drafted the laws according to which the taxes on distilled spirits and tobacco are now collected; and we believe we are entirely justified in asserting that if these gentlemen had been allowed by Congress to carry out their ideas sooner, and in the manner they originally proposed, the country would have, up to this time, collected a good deal more revenue, at considerably less trouble and expense.

Mr. Delano, furthermore, in discussing this subject, omits to notice that all of these reforms were strenuously opposed in Congress by many of the very men who now on the stump are loudly claiming credit for the adoption and execution of them. When the Internal Revenue Bill of July, 1868, was before the Senate, Mr. Morton, of Indiana, in particular, was outspoken in his opposition, and voted in favor of the continuance of the two-dollar tax on distilled spirits; as did also Messrs. Anthony, Cole, Edmunds, Harlan, Morrill of Maine, Nye, Pomeroy, Wade, and others. Mr. Morton, indeed, seemed to plant himself on the platform of opposition to all reforms on taxation, for in his speech opposing the reduction of the tax on distilled spirits, he used the following language: "We threw away twenty or twenty-five millions of revenue by repealing the tax on cotton totally last winter, under peculiar circumstances, and we can now see from the price of cotton and from the general promise of its production, that we acted very unwisely." In the House, also, the reduction was objected to by Thaddeus Stevens; and Mr. Boutwell, true then as now to his instincts and apprehensions, declared "that if we put the tax below fifty cents, we certainly shall be deficient in the necessary revenue to carry on the government."

Equally disingenuous is Mr. Delano's claim that the large increase of fifty-nine millions that has accrued within the last two years in the Customs revenue, is due to the "superiority of the Administration" in efficiency and honesty, as compared with the exercise of the same qualities by the Administration that preceded it, when the fact is patent to every one that the recent increase of customs revenue is due to an increase of imports, and that the only connection that the present Government can claim with these is that, by maintaining unnecessary taxes for an unreasonable extinction of the public debt, and doing nothing to improve the currency, it has favored a continuance of that state of affairs which, for the last eight years, has made the United States the very best possible market of the world for foreign nations to sell in, but the very poorest to buy from. In truth, the experience of the last ten years in respect to the collection of the revenue is rather a dangerous subject for Administration orators to deal with. Mr. Delano was Commissioner of Internal Revenue for a year or more,

and gave less personal attention to the duties of his office than any commissioner that ever preceded him; while, for the last year, there has never been so little efficiency in the management of this bureau and so little sense and harmony in its rulings and decisions. Thus the income-tax, for example, has been so intentionally muddled in its workings, that what little Congress left of it has hardly paid the cost of collection; the annual receipts from distilled spirits are understood to have declined, during the past year, to an extent of at least ten millions, with no diminution but rather an increase in the quantity manufactured and consumed; while the article itself is generally understood to be purchasable in the various leading markets at a price which is either less than the cost of production *plus* the tax, or at rates which cannot honestly admit of any profit on its manufacture.

It is also notorious that smuggling is continually on the increase, and is probably carried on at the present time to a greater extent and more systematically along our coasts and borders than at any former period of our history. In St. John's and Halifax, the fact that a large and increasing business of this kind is going on is no longer a matter of any concealment. Tourists upon the border this summer have had continued intimations that foreign goods of value, but of comparatively little bulk, can be delivered to them at any designated point in the States for a slight advance upon the cost in the Provinces; while journeys are now avowedly taken to the British possessions and to Europe for the purpose of the purchase of clothing, the difference in the cost of a suit of clothes between Montreal and New York being more than sufficient to pay the travelling expenses between the two cities. Any one, furthermore, who has fished or sailed along the Long Island coast or Sound during the past two years, and has been cautiously inquisitive, must have abundantly satisfied himself that, if ship-building and fishing on these waters are not so productive as formerly, the fishermen have made up for their deficiencies in a way that has, in a great degree, ceased to be a mystery.

We desire, finally, to call attention to one other rather singular statement in the speech of Mr. Delano, as reported. He says:

"Observe, further, that in 1868, in the last Administration, the expenses of the Internal Revenue Bureau were \$8,387,793 17, while for the first fiscal year of this Administration the same expenses were reduced to \$5,916,410 22, making a gross reduction of the cost of collecting the revenue of \$2,471,382 95."

Where Mr. Delano obtains the figures for the above statement we do not know; but we do know that they are not in accordance with his own official report, or the report of the Secretary of the Treasury. Thus, in the Internal Revenue report for 1869, C. Delano, Commissioner, page 17, the expenses of collecting the internal revenue for the year 1868 are stated to have been \$8,776,814; and for the year 1869 \$7,394,395. But of this latter year, eight months were included under the Johnson Administration. For the year 1870, the report of the Secretary of the Treasury, page 18, gives the actual net expenditure of "assessing and collecting internal revenue" at \$7,234,531, which makes the actual decrease on a fair comparison \$160,863 in place of \$2,471,382.

But this method of comparing the annual expenses of the internal revenue, without making any allowance for the work done or the revenues collected, as Mr. Delano does, is obviously unfair; as every one knows that during the four years of the Johnson Administration the taxes were much more numerous and complicated, and required the services of a far greater number of officers than at present. Keeping this fact in view, we find that in 1866 and 1867, when the annual *net* collections were 309 millions and 263 millions respectively, the percentage cost of assessing and collection to net receipts was 2.4 for 1866, and 3.4 for 1867. But in 1869-70, the first full fiscal year of the Grant Administration, the percentage of cost to collections was 3.8; and that, too, when the number of officials in the latter year was very much less than at any time previously, whole districts having been consolidated, and the number of assessments reduced in consequence to an extent of from twenty-five to fifty per cent. We do not, however, assert that this, or any other method of comparing cost with results under the internal revenue, is in all respects fair; but since Mr. Delano has seen fit to present one side of the case for political purposes, he cannot reasonably object to our turning the picture round and showing the other side.

In short, this whole speech, which is paraded as a model of financial perspicuity, is simply a tissue of unfair, sophistical reasoning, in which results which have come about through causes entirely independent of the Administration, and in spite, as it were, of its interference, are attempted to be used for partisan purposes. The people for a time may be deceived by such financial reasoning, but in the end it will be found that such speeches as those of the Hon. Columbus Delano will, like certain old muskets, prove decidedly more dangerous to those who stand at the breech than those who are in front of the muzzle.

THE BOTTOM OF THE GREAT CITY DIFFICULTY.

THE meeting to consider the financial abuses of the government of this city, on Monday evening, was very remarkable for numbers and enthusiasm, but most remarkable for the thoughtful speech of Mr. Ottendorfer, the editor of the *Staats-Zeitung*. He said, and said truly, that there was little use in denouncing or abolishing the Ring if the state of things out of which rings grow was allowed to remain; if the city was to be used as a football by the two political parties; and if, he might have added, its administration was to be for ever based on a set of assumptions which everybody knows to be utterly groundless. The facts of the situation are these:

New York, according to the late census, has 71,342 native voters against 113,266 of foreign birth—a foreign majority of 41,924—the native voters being less than two-thirds of the foreign. The native vote is also affected more by sickness, absence, business engagements, and neglect; the foreign is swelled by the voters generally giving to the canvass attention, zeal, and labor, and, upon the day of election, making the success of their party their pleasure and business. Further than this, a large portion of those classed as native are in effect foreign, being merely native of the Irish or German parts of the city, and bound to the foreign vote by race, religion, and political training. Finally, the tendency of things is, that the proportion of the native vote will diminish and that of the foreign increase, the one class seeking residence in the suburbs, and the other growing denser in the town. It is manifest that, so long as the two remain opposed to each other, and the foreign vote remains undivided, the native, though a unit, must be hopelessly subject to it. As matter of fact, these votes now are opposed to each other, the foreign forming the bulk of one party, and the native forming the bulk of the other.

The voters also consist of two other classes—those who are stockholders and those who are not. For the city, though called a government, is but a corporation. Its debts are a lien upon every man's real property, and the private property of the corporators may yet be sold to pay the public debts of the corporation. It has no power, as true governments have, over the life or liberty of a resident, and has only a restricted authority over property within its corporate limits. It has a few petty powers, enabling it to make petty ordinances, in the nature of police regulations; but it cannot make laws. These powers, moreover, the legislature grants at will, and at will can take away. The object of the corporation is mainly to manage such property as is owned in common—the streets, the parks, the wharves, and the public buildings. Such being the legal status of the city, it presents the extraordinary paradox of a corporation ruled by those who are not corporators, and of corporate indebtedness incurred by those who are not responsible for its payment. New York, to all intents and purposes, is precisely like a railroad company where the passengers elect directors, appoint employees, and incur debts; but where the stockholders, though allowed to vote at the elections and to protest against the indebtedness, are a helpless minority. And it is assumed that because this railroad company is authorized by law to license pawnbrokers, and regulate the sale of liquors within its trains and upon its track, therefore the pawnbrokers, liquor-dealers, and other passengers have a natural and constitutional right to vote down the stockholders and mortgage the road.

Of the passengers who ride on this road, some are honest, many well-meaning, the mass indifferent and ignorant. In appealing to them for redress, the distant stockholders, engaged in other pursuits, and giving but little time to the management of the road, have no chance of success against the ever-present, always-active employees, who make it their daily business to retain their places by managing the

passengers, cajoling one, bribing another, bullying a third. Once or twice in the modern history of the company the employees have quarrelled among themselves, thereby dividing the passenger vote, and enabling the stockholders to carry an election; but never when united have they failed to control the passenger vote and keep themselves in place. At the present time there is excitement because the employees have refused, for a long while, to let the stockholders know the amount of fares and freights collected, and the magnitude of debts incurred. The employees are calm, for they believe that the excitement merely extends to the owners of the road. They know full well that the indifferent passengers will not be greatly exercised by that which does not concern themselves, and for the most part believe that if the stockholders want help they are abundantly able to help themselves. This calmness takes expression in the assurance that the excitement will soon blow over; which means that the uninterested passengers will soon cease to listen to the complainings of the interested stockholders, and will hereafter rule the road as completely as they have ruled it heretofore. Note here that the employees also know full well that if they should limit the sale of liquor on the track, or pull down pawnbrokers' balls, or make these gentry pay for the accidents they cause, instead of compelling the innocent stockholders to foot those bills, then there would be an excitement among the passengers which would not soon blow over. Note, also, lest you confound the analogy, that the rate of fares to be charged and the number of trains to be run are not discretionary with either employees or stockholders, but regulated by law.

I. The first remedy which any sane mind would suggest to correct these abuses would be to place the funds of the city under the control of the men who contribute them: to let the corporation be controlled by those who pay its expenses, to secure to city taxpayers otherwise qualified to vote the exclusive right to vote at charter elections for charter officers, and with respect to charter liabilities. These taxpayers are not a class of society, for they differ in creed, condition, politics, opinions, and constitute what might be termed "responsible society." Having bought their way into New York, and given pledges of their interest in her welfare, it would seem that they should not be robbed of their investments, nor deprived of the inalienable right accorded to most men, to take care of their property and of themselves. But inasmuch as the directness of common sense is apt to be first regarded as theoretic, visionary, and unconstitutional; and inasmuch as there is no constitutional convention now sitting at Albany, it will be useless at this time to consider seriously so simple and efficacious a remedy.

II. The next remedy is that understood to be commended by the *Tribune*—the remedy which in civilized communities men are supposed to seek and be content with—a resort to courts of law. It is said that we must contemplate its efficacy with doubt. To doubt the law as the surest remedy for righting great wrongs in the places of our established civilization, is almost to acknowledge the American Republic a failure, and mankind safer under the late French Empire. If actions could be brought to recover moneys had and received, not only against officials and contractors, but also against members of the legislature, publicly charged with having received the city's money, the effect would be most healthful, no matter what the pecuniary result might be. If the country legislator disposed to be bribed was taught that he might be compelled to run the gauntlet of a lawsuit, with its expenses and exposures, and be brought into court and wrenched and shaken on the witness-stand, he would be inclined to retain the old-fashioned view of virtue and vice. But legal proceedings must be instituted by the law officers of the city and county, the Counsel for the Corporation and the District Attorney; and legal proceedings, where unscrupulous wealth is defendant, and the result doubtful and far off, need to be pressed with skill and ability and invincible resolve. Where the defendants will set up every technical defence, and, regardless of costs, interpose every obstacle and pretext, the plaintiff needs a relentless counsel, with mind and heart unchangeably fixed. Such suits also require courts with judges free to do right, looking toward the substantial ends of justice, who will not long allow pretexts to come between justice and the suitor. And

they require officers to summon jurors and execute the process of the court who look to the law as their master. Whether these conditions of successful litigation can be complied with, it is hardly worth while to discuss. If there is a power called the Ring ruling New York, such as is said to exist, that power can undoubtedly replace capable officers by incapable, and honest by dishonest. Such litigation, with our defective judicial system, must be a work of years, and in the course of years so absolute a power can work great changes, if it so desire, in an elected judiciary and with elective law officers. Further investigation of the subject would speedily bring us back to the state of things previously sketched. The simple truth is, that the community of New York is not a unit in this matter, and that the responsible majority care for no such suits being brought, and desire no such result to be reached.

III. The third remedy is that which the *Evening Post* has advocated—a new charter—the intervention of the legislature, a provisional city government (which of course must be only temporary), and then a new "popular government," under which the people of New York shall be allowed to rule and manage the city. With all respect for that able journal, it is difficult to bring these views down to any practical application. If "popular government" means a government under which everybody votes, and the numerical majority rules, such a government the city already has. In structure it is the best the city ever had, bringing the responsibility down to a few conspicuous heads, and finally concentrating it on one. But no structure of government can be devised that will counteract of itself its own maladministration, any more than boilers can be built which drunken engineers cannot blow to pieces. That a great portion of our citizens are honest and well-meaning, having the interests of the city at heart, and being indignant at the conduct of their rulers, may be true. That the united, earnest efforts of all honest men would accomplish much, may also be true. But it is a waste of words to talk to one who has been through such battles as that, for instance, of the Tieman-Wood campaign, of seriously expecting victory, and successive future victories, from this transitory diversion of the enemy's forces. That enemy occupies an entrenched camp, with 100,000 men, well drilled and handled by experienced officers. It is proposed to attack him with 50,000 high-spirited militia, officered by patriotic gentlemen, who have never seen actual service. In cold, plain English, it is impossible. The *Times*, *Post*, and *Tribune* might give their entire columns to the cause, and teem with earnest and eloquent editorials for months, but there are 100,000 voters who never read *Post*, *Tribune*, or *Times*. Where are the 100,001 to overcome them? Arithmetic is not pleasant reading, but it cannot be refuted by rhetoric.

IV. The fourth remedy is a vigilance committee. This is a startling thing to say; but if the judiciary shall cease to administer legal justice, and the legislative power can grant no relief, the revolution of force must sooner or later follow. No community suffers for ever. The Anglo-Saxon race has never consented long to stand still and be robbed, and has cared little whether the robber was highwayman or king, corporation or parliament. In our Western towns, the vigilance committee came quickly to administer justice when the courts ceased to do so. No one can predict when the remedy of force will or will not be resorted to. New York may now be much nearer to it than most men suspect. But the resort to force would be a great and awful calamity, undeserving the name of remedy, and is enumerated here only as an incentive to find that which may bring a lasting and peaceful reform.

We suggested two weeks ago what we believe to be the best thing practicable in the existing state of public opinion in the State at large which is to furnish the majority of the legislature. That this is a radical remedy, however, we do not believe, nor do we believe that the radical remedy will be reached till sorrowful experience and much discussion shall have brought about a more rational mode of dealing with political and social problems than now prevails. The root of the trouble which now afflicts New York, and which before the close of the century will, we venture to predict, afflict every large city in the country, is to be found in our adoption and adhesion to the absurd mediæval tradition that a city is a political community and

should be governed as such. A city was a political community when cities were really fortresses and the inhabitants were a garrison, constantly in arms to repel the aggressions of their neighbors in the country and resist the exactions of their own government. No such state of things prevails in our day. The inhabitants of no modern city, and especially of no commercial city, are held together by political bonds such as those which united the mediæval burghers, from whom our politicians borrow their talk about "municipal rights" and municipal independence. New York, for instance, is a place in which large numbers of merchants, traders, and manufacturers have settled for the carrying on of their business. The streets, houses, warehouses, and wharves are the implements of their business. It is their duty and their interest to keep the streets paved, drained, lighted, and swept, the piers in good repair, and the markets in good order. It ought to be left to them—that is, to the owners of houses—to do all this at their own expense and within certain limits in their own way. The vast horde of persons who swarm here to pick up a living, and who now vote away all this property, without having any direct interest in it, should have nothing to do with the management of municipal affairs any more than with those of a railroad on which they travel. They are citizens of the State. The State is bound to protect them in the enjoyment of all their political rights, on Broadway as much as on the Hudson River Railroad, and to see that the taxpayers make proper provision for their safety and comfort in their goings and comings. But calling on them to elect the city government and vote the city taxes has been for many years a ridiculous anachronism. It was sure to end, before long, in open and undisguised robbery. It has already done so, and we cannot say we are sorry. It brings us nearer to the day when we shall legislate like rational beings on the facts of human nature and of human experience.

In the meantime, the first thing to be done, and especially by the Republicans, is, as far as we can, to take municipal affairs out of party politics; and, if we may make a suggestion to our brethren of the Republican press, we will say that the first step towards this is the absolute abandonment of their much-loved theory, that a man who holds Democratic opinions must be favorable to corruption. It is true that all horse-thieves, as old Dr. Dwight said, are Democrats, but it is not true that all Democrats are horse-thieves; and we shall never have their co-operation in reform measures till we give up so considering them.

FRANCE.—THE PROLONGATION OF THE EXECUTIVE.

PARIS, August 18.

It is a painful task to witness and to describe the state of the political world in France. In the physical world, you can fairly hope to solve a problem when you know all the properties of the definite bodies which are involved in the same phenomenon; but among Frenchmen, as among all Latin races, there seem to be no definite properties in politics, no natural elements—the molecules change continually, by a sort of mystic process, their weight, their form, their color. Take the case of Spain. The revolution which upset the corrupted government of Isabella seemed to have a very determinate object: it was made by the friends of the Duc de Montpensier, apparently to put the Duc de Montpensier on the throne, in the character of a liberal, tolerant, and constitutional sovereign. What happened in reality? As soon as the Cortes met, they split in factions; every statesman, if we can give such a name to Serrano, Prim, Olozaga, and others who are merely individuals, tried to make the best possible bargain with the new sovereign. To-day the Duc de Montpensier is in a quiet village of the Pyrenees, almost in exile, and Spain, after having looked for a king, has found one at last in Italy; but the pride of the Spanish nation suffers under a foreign dynasty, which has no association with its own history. The beginning and the end of the Spanish revolution are in contradiction with each other; they do not seem to be chapters of the same drama. Statesmanship has been fairly beaten by individualism.

Individualism is also claiming its rights in France. In an evil hour, when everything seemed lost, Thiers offered himself to France as a saviour; he was willing to sign a dishonorable peace; he asked for no high honors, for no personal distinctions; he accepted, he said, power as sacrifice, as a duty. He told the Chamber at Bordeaux that he would be

nothing but its servant. If ever a Chamber could obtain an absolute sovereignty, it was that Chamber, meeting after so many disasters, when everybody had failed, when Napoleon III. was a prisoner, when the government of the 4th September had been compelled to capitulate. France was like a *tabula rasa*. The political edifice had been shattered to its very foundations; it was necessary to build a new one. Such at least would have been the advice of statesmanship. Real statesmen would have told the people honestly: Consult your own minds, reflect well, let us have a settled government, the government of your own free will—a real republic or a real monarchy. The national will in such a crisis ought to find no revolutionary opposition. If there is one, we will crush it without mercy in the name of all that is sacred in every country. A government so founded, when all hearts were still exalted, purified by misfortune, could have lived. If the country had freely chosen the Republic, what pretender would have denied its right and dared to put his ambition before the will of France? If it had chosen constitutional monarchy as a shelter and a better place of safety against monarchical Europe as well as against socialism, all honest republicans would have been bound to submit to such a decision. But individualism crept in and opposed any decision; it felt instinctively that a decision taken under such solemn circumstances was without appeal; and it preferred the uncertainties of an unsettled future to the certainties of a settlement.

An American mind can, I suppose, hardly understand the perverse temptations of a revolutionary state of things. Your statesmen are like married men who are faithful to their wives, and know all they have to expect from them; to our political men, politics seems like a mistress ever young and ever-changing. Each revolution may add something to their fame, to their fortune, to their influence. It has absolutely come to this that they prefer everything to a domestic *status in quo*. There are, of course, hundreds of deputies who think better, but they are not the leaders of opinion; they are the unknown members, whose political cowardice is even greater than their honesty. Many of them left their native towns to go to Bordeaux, fully determined to proclaim a constitutional king; but as soon as they found themselves among the *Dii majores* of the political Olympus, they lost their liberty. They named Thiers chief of the executive of the Republic, though they were adverse to a republic; now they are asked to name him President of the Republic for three years, and perhaps they will do it. At Bordeaux, M. Thiers told them that they must reorganize France and not reconstitute; which means that they must proclaim no definitive form of government, frame no definitive constitution. Now his friends come forward and present to the Chamber what cannot be looked upon as different from a constitution. Hitherto the powers of M. Thiers have been vague and undefined; he was nothing more than the servant of the house, a first minister charged with executive powers; and even in his executive capacity he was always subject to the orders of the Assembly. But if the Rivet proposition is voted, he will be really the president of a republic; his power will be unassailable by the Chamber during a certain period, and the Assembly will have no other method of resisting him than the suicidal method of dissolution. And, in this case, there is very little doubt that M. Thiers, remaining alone in power during the electoral period, will manage the elections exactly as the Empire used to do.

The Rivet proposition amounts, therefore, not only to the virtual proclamation of the Republic, but it institutes a republic which is more after the model of some South American governments than after the model of the United States or of Switzerland—a republic in name, a personal government in fact. Was I wrong when I said that individualism had taken the place of statesmanship among us? M. Thiers is no more willing to abandon his place to another President of the Republic than to a king. He has no real faith in the republican form of government; he has attacked it all his life. He believes it to be fitted only for semi-civilized nations; at least, he always did believe so; and it is rather singular that he should have changed his mind only when it suited his personal ambition to do so. He knows better than anybody that the great mass of the Conservatives in France dread the very name of Republic, which is identified with the Terror of the past and the Commune of the present; that after his own Republic, which he himself calls the Republic without republicans, there may come the Republic of Gambetta, which will not be without republicans, and may throw France back into the arms of a Napoleon IV. All the monarchical members of the Assembly know all this too; they must see that if they name M. Thiers President of the Republic, it will not matter much if they add that this settlement is only a temporary one. Every agitation for the monarchy will be immediately

treated as a conspiracy, and even be looked upon with uneasiness by the more timid Conservatives. They have been once deceived at Bordeaux; and now, with their eyes wide open, they are drifting toward new delusions.

Correspondence.

MR. BOUTWELL AND THE "NATION."

TO THE EDITOR OF THE NATION:

SIR: Do you care to know what your readers think of your writings?

Let me thank you for your good service against Butler, for he is a most contemptible demagogue, it seems to me. But I cannot understand your course toward Boutwell. I have known him personally for fourteen years, and he seems to me one of the manliest men we have in Washington. He is a "business man," for it was purely as such that he achieved his success in the Massachusetts Legislature, and was elected Governor of the State. His legal studies (formal) came later—only about ten or twelve years ago, I think.

After the doubts expressed by the *Nation* last spring upon the question of getting money on the new loan, when money was worth $6\frac{1}{2}$ to 7, and bade fair to remain at that price (views in which I concurred), it seems to me that it would be more noble to "own up" than to be taking every means to belittle the success which Mr. Boutwell has made of it. That editorial on the "Syndicate" is certainly worthy of some member of a "first-class" banking house not included among those solicited to aid in placing the loan. I do not suppose it was indited by any such person; but that and other articles read as if somebody "did" the finances of the *Nation* who was so prejudiced against Mr. Boutwell as to be incapable of doing him justice.—Very respectfully,

S. M. FREELAND.

DETROIT, MICH., Sept. 2, 1871.

[Our hostility to Mr. Boutwell is of long standing, as every reader of the *Nation* knows, and, it is perhaps well to add, is not in the least personal, but purely professional. It is now almost necessary even for a man who is pursuing a mad dog—we mean nothing disrespectful to Mr. Boutwell by this illustration—to declare loudly, in order to induce bystanders to join in the chase, that he himself has not been bitten, but is trying to kill it on public grounds. The causes of our hostility are these:

1. Mr. Boutwell's *a priori* unfitness for the Treasury Department, which he got for the simple and absurd reason that he was "a Radical." It is true, in the earlier part of his life he was a "business man"—that is, the keeper of a small country store; he has since been simply a professional politician; and to talk of him as a "business man," meaning thereby that his business career has been of a kind to prepare him to be the financial minister of a great nation, is highly disingenuous.

2. His steady, determined opposition, which he takes no pains to conceal, to civil service reform; his faith, which he openly avows, in the present corrupt and degrading system; and the silly arguments—such, for instance, as the usefulness of the Government offices in helping young men to enter the professions—by which he has defended it in his reports.

3. His narrowness and ignorance—as displayed in his belief, astounding in a Secretary of the Treasury, that there is no such thing as a science of political economy, and no use in statistics; in his refusal to allow the Treasury to give information to be used in legislating on the income-tax; and in his treatment of Mr. Wells, whose expulsion from office he procured, although that gentleman was the first person, and the only person, who had collected reliable information as to the economical condition of the country, for the guidance of Congress and the people, at a time of extraordinary financial perplexity.

4. His believing, or affecting to believe, that he could, if authorized, borrow \$1,500,000,000 at five, four, and four and a half per cent., and procuring legislation in aid of his experiment; and his permitting reports to be circulated during a whole year afterwards, that the loan was in a fair way of being taken; and his finally issuing \$200,000,000 of the above amount as a "new loan" to a "Syndicate," he well knowing that it was a small scrap of the old loan, which he was try-

ing to place by extraordinary and still doubtful and unexplained expedients. We are very glad to have the United States borrow \$200,000,000 at five per cent., but, before we praise Mr. Boutwell for bringing it about, we need to know more than we know now of the cost of the operation, of its legal correctness, and of the nature of the relations of the Treasury to the "Syndicate." On all these points there are widespread suspicions, which he would do well to clear away. And does Mr. Freeland recollect how many millions of the two hundred millions were taken by the national banks under pressure of an intimidating circular sent round to them by the Secretary's financial agents? Does he suppose that Mr. Boutwell can truthfully deny that in placing the last \$70,000,000 of the \$200,000,000 he has violated the law of Congress authorizing the new loan, and forbidding him to incur in placing it an expense greater than one half of one per cent. of the amount placed?

5. His failure to make any efforts for a return to specie payments.

6. His disregard of the law of the land, openly avowed in a recently made decision, in which he says:

"It is also suggested in the argument of counsel for claimant that, inasmuch as the claim has been passed by the accounting officer, the Secretary of the Treasury has no discretion in the matter, and that it is his duty to sign the warrant and to allow the payment to be made, whether or not such payment is approved by his own judgment. This theory of the duty of the Secretary of the Treasury cannot be admitted. Every Secretary of the Treasury, as I am informed, has practically recognized it to be his duty to pass upon all claims, as far as they are brought to his notice; and in no instance, in the history of the Government, has this power on the part of the Secretary of the Treasury been waived. Such is my conviction of the necessity for its occasional exercise, that I shall do nothing calculated to impair the authority of the Department in this particular."

The law on this point is the following:

"An act to amend an act entitled 'An act to provide for the prompt settlement of public accounts,' approved March three, eighteen hundred and seventeen.

"Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the act of March three, eighteen hundred and seventeen, entitled 'An act to provide for the prompt settlement of public accounts,' shall not be construed to authorize the heads of departments to change or modify the balances that may be certified to them by the Commissioner of Customs or the Comptroller of the Treasury, but that such balances, when stated by the Auditor and properly certified by the Comptroller as provided by that act, shall be taken and considered as final and conclusive upon the executive branch of the Government, and be subject to revision only by Congress or the proper courts: provided, That the head of the proper department, before signing a warrant for any balance certified to him by a comptroller, may submit to such comptroller any facts in his judgment affecting the correctness of such balance, but the decision of the Comptroller thereon shall be final and conclusive, as hereinbefore provided.

"Approved March 30, 1868."

This is plain and explicit, and certainly it should not have escaped the Secretary's notice. But to leave no room for doubt either as to the law on this subject or the practice of the Government under the law relating to it, we call attention to a little piece of history of which the Secretary is, we trust, ignorant. During the third session of the Fortieth Congress, the Second Comptroller adjusted and allowed revised claims for money due for army transportation to the payment of which the Quartermaster-General was earnestly opposed. The statute above quoted rendered the adjustments and settlements thus made final and conclusive. This was during Andrew Johnson's Administration, which was accused of something akin to contempt for statutory enactments when they stood in its way. But this statute was so plain and positive that it could not be evaded or disregarded. The Secretary of War, at the instigation of the Quartermaster-General, sent to Congress a communication suggesting that the statute be repealed or modified. That communication was, like the same same request on one or two previous occasions in our history, referred to the Committee of the House of Representatives on the Revision of the Laws, of which an excellent lawyer, Judge Poland, of Vermont, was chairman, and of which Mr. Jenckes, of Rhode Island, and Judge Woodward, of Pennsylvania, were members. In February, 1869, that committee made its report, a portion of which we here insert, as follows. The law, and the reason of the law, the committee thus made plain:

"By the act of March 3, 1817, the offices of accountants in the War and Navy Departments were abolished, and it was provided that thereafter 'all claims and demands whatever by the United States or against them, and all accounts whatever in which the United States are concerned, either as debtors or creditors, shall be settled and adjusted in the Treasury Department.'

"This act provided for the appointment of an additional comptroller and four auditors, making in all two comptrollers and five auditors, and entire and complete jurisdiction over the settlement and adjustment of all the claims and demands above-mentioned was vested in these officers.

"This system of settling public accounts has been in operation from 1817 to the present time.

"The act provided for no appeal to, or revision by, the Secretary of the Treasury, or the head of any department in which the claim originated, and it is evident, from the language used, that the final decision by these officers was to be conclusive, except by a resort to Congress or the courts.

"The committee are satisfied that it was the intent of the framers of the act of 1817 to establish a tribunal for the settlement and adjustment of accounts against the Government that should be wholly independent of, and in no way subject to, control or revision by those departments or officers by whom the public expenditures and liabilities are incurred.

"The special provisions of many subsequent acts show that such was the understanding of Congress. The leading principle upon which this system of accounting and adjustment was established appears to have been that all accounts, involving the expenditure and disbursement of public moneys, should be settled and adjusted by officers holding under appointments independent of the heads of departments, and who, themselves, had nothing to do with the disbursements. In short, they designed to prevent officers who made or directed the expenditure from having any voice or influence in judging of the legality or rightfulness of it, and such check was necessary to insure a judicious and honest expenditure of the public funds.

"As a general rule, this interpretation of the act of 1817 has prevailed ever since its passage. We do not find that it has ever been questioned by anybody except the War Department. There has been an occasional restiveness in that department at being subject to the decision of these accounting officers upon accounts arising in the Quartermaster-General's office.

"As early as 1823, the question was raised as to the conclusiveness of an adjudication by the accounting officers of the Treasury Department upon an account arising in the Quartermaster's Department, and the question was referred to Mr. Wirt, then Attorney-General. The whole subject was fully and exhaustively considered by him in an elaborate opinion, and the conclusion reached that the adjudication of claims by the accounting officers of the Treasury was final and conclusive, and binding upon all the executive departments of the Government.

"In the judgment of the committee, the present system of public accounting (which has worked so satisfactorily, with few interruptions, for more than half a century) ought not to be disturbed, and [it is their opinion] that the act of March 30, 1868, which was designed to prevent such interruptions in the future, was just and wise, and that no necessity exists for its repeal or modification."

Such is the law, such the reason of it, and such Mr. Boutwell's coolly avowed attitude towards it.

7. A series of evasions and misrepresentations which have issued from the Treasury Department, which we have commented on elsewhere, and of which Mr. Boutwell must bear part of the responsibility, for in all that relates to moneys and accounts, silence or acquiescence which misleads is as culpable as words which mislead.

8. His taking away the foreign banking business of the Government from the Barings, one of the greatest banking firms in the world, which had for nearly a century transacted it with probity and honor, and giving it suddenly to a new and comparatively unknown firm, which first raised its head in this city during the gold excitement of the war, and has had a footing in Europe for twelve calendar months, or thereabouts, and giving, through the columns of the press, or allowing to be given, in justification of this change, a ridiculous and utterly false story—which was formally contradicted when it first saw the light, three years ago—about the agent of the Barings knocking Mr. Seward up in the night, during the war, to get payment of a small balance which the State Department had overdrawn.—ED. NATION.]

MILTON'S VIEWS OF CHURCH GOVERNMENT.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE NATION:

SIR: I was somewhat surprised to find in [the *Nation* of August 10] the inexact statement that John Milton was a Presbyterian. We have abundant proof that he was, like Cromwell, doctrinally and politically an Independent. Dexter and other writers on Congregational polity refer to him as one of their modern authorities. His "Christian Doctrine," and other works on church order, maintain views now recognized as substantially Congregational.

But this error is one of political history as well as of church order. It

is one very like that which Dr. Bacon corrects when he discriminates between the Puritans and the Plymouth Pilgrims. There was a considerable opposition in views and conduct between Presbyterians and Independents in the years immediately preceding and following the death of King Charles. Milton's views on one point of division are tersely summed up in that famous line:

"New Presbyter is but Old Priest writ large."

The death of the king was demanded by the Independents and opposed by the Presbyterians. Milton not only defended the act when accomplished, in his two "Defences," but wrote just previous his "Tenure of Kings and Magistrates," designed, in part, to show that the Presbyterians had acted inconsistently. Other passages in his writings are of the same purport.

F. HURD.

ORFORD, IOWA, Aug. 17, 1871.

[Mr. Masson says, p. 376: "It [the pamphlet entitled 'The Reason of Church Government urged against Prelaty,' published in 1641] informs us that Milton was at this time a kind of Presbyterian. The form of church government which he then desired to see set up in England was one somewhat after the model of the Presbyterian Kirk of Scotland, as restored by Henderson and the Glasgow Assembly of 1638. As this is a fact not generally recognized, and as Milton afterwards snapped his connection with Presbyterianism and turned round upon it with fury as no better than Episcopacy, it may be well to bring the matter out by specific quotation.

"At the very outset of his pamphlet Milton declares the question respecting church government to be 'whether it ought to be Presbyterian or Prelatical'; nay, shortly afterwards (chap. iii.) he has a sentence which shows that, at this time, there was little thought, either in his mind or in that of people round him, of the possibility of any form of church government that should not be definable as the one or the other of these two. 'This position,' he says, 'is to be first laid down as granted, that one of these two, and none other, is of God's ordaining.' It probably will not require argument to show that Milton was not an Episcopalian. . . . But he is more specific," Mr. Masson says further on. "Not only does he think of councils or general assemblies over a whole country as the court of last resort in cases of church dispute, but he thinks of such assemblies as constituted or led up to by smaller and more local bodies, each acting on the same principle of free debate and vote. 'Of such a council as this,' he says, speaking of a council of the church over a large tract of territory, 'every parochial consistory is a right homogeneous and constituting part; being in itself, as it were, a little synod.'"

This is being "a pronounced Presbyterian." Undoubtedly it would have been better if we had added, "at this period of his life." But a glance at the context will show that we had in mind his views on doctrine, not on discipline. We are glad, however, of this opportunity to bring out a point which we did not make sufficiently clear in our former article.—ED. NATION.]

THE FEDERAL ARMY'S INTERFERENCE IN LOUISIANA POLITICS.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE NATION:

SIR: The demand you make in the first article of your issue of the 24th inst. for the removal of Marshal Packard and Collector Casey clearly shows that you were not in possession of as accurate information regarding the "musket mistake" as was at your command when, in a following article, you forcibly proved [the carpet-bag government of this State to be a curse alike to our people and the Republican party, by simply stating one of the many truthful charges that are made against it. Before the supposition you start out with is made, you must know that the troops were technically in the custom-house to "protect the Government property," but really to overawe the "Thugs" of 1866, who, under various guises, had been employed by the Governor, through his supporters, to enable him to browbeat the Dunn majority upon the temporary organization and gain control of the convention by appointing a committee on credentials who would not hesitate to seat a sufficient number of his bogus delegates to let him have his own way. Every well-informed man in the city of New Orleans, of whatever party, will tell you that the presence of those troops prevented a riot. But as the troops could not have been legally used to protect the lives of the Dunn delegates, even had a riot taken place, the

Marshal got over the difficulty by employing, without expense to the Government, a large number of deputy marshals to "protect the United States Court room" (and doubtless to fight if necessary), and ordered them to admit no one until half an hour before the hour fixed for the meeting of the convention, and then to admit only those having tickets. Every delegate, and every pretended delegate, received a ticket, thus admitting to the hall only those persons claiming seats in the convention. This was as fair for one side as the other, and had the excellent object in view of excluding the dreaded Thugs. "Warmoth and his Republicans needed" no "nerve" to enforce their right to enter the convention hall; they needed the desire to do it under circumstances that would give the other wing immunity from intimidation. Warmoth came to the hall as a contesting delegate, with his ticket in his hand, two hours before the time, and was told he would have to wait until the hour for opening the hall should arrive, the same thing that was told, under precisely the same circumstances, to more than forty Dunn delegates. With this pretext, this chief of intimidators drew off and sent up a howl of "military intimidation," which has been re-echoed and magnified by newspapers whose inaccurate knowledge of our dreadful situation, or whose overweening desire to make a point against Gen. Grant, have led them to give their great support to the carpet-bag oppressor of the honest but misused and misrepresented colored masses. You of the North must remember that all that money power and brains can do to deceive you in regard to the deplorable condition of Louisiana affairs has been and will be done. You must know that the Dunn party embraces almost every colored man in the State, except a few leaders, who are jealous of Dunn, and hold lucrative positions under Warmoth, but that it is very poor, has no newspaper, and no powerful friend save Grant. This "Dunn movement" is a rebellion on the part of these betrayed black men against Mr. Greeley's "thieving carpet-baggers," and whoever insists upon the removal of Marshal Packard and Collector Casey practically insists upon perpetuating the almost dictatorial power which that class of adventurers have concentrated into the hands of their ingenious chief, the Governor. I was a Dunn delegate, and I earnestly declare I never would have trusted my life near the convention had it assembled at any other place in the city, or without the precaution taken by Marshal Packard, who would doubtless gladly suffer decapitation in order to win the crown of a martyr to honesty and with it the next Governorship of the State. But what I started out to ask the *Nation* is this: Knowing, as the Dunn men did certainly know, that unless troops were present they would either have to suffer intimidation and see their slim majority overruled by fraud, or be killed, what should they have done? Does it pay to wait until you are killed before you appeal for protection from the threats of your legally constituted protector? If a "loyal" Governor unquestionably demands of a political convention an endorsement of himself or the blood of its members, should the convention appeal to the President for protecting troops and Gatling guns, or submit to the Governor's practical dictatorship? Should the President remove the Marshal for having the nerve to risk his official and physical head in behalf of the people and liberty, or should he merely reprove him for not appealing directly to the President and squarely stating the purpose for which the troops were wanted? In a State where the entire legislative and judicial departments are despotically concentrated into the hands of a usurping Governor, if the General Government cannot at any time, and under any circumstances, protect the lives of any of its citizens against anybody, be he a Governor, what is the use of having a flag or a President? In short, "are we a nation?" I will close with the prediction that when this farce has sufficiently disclosed the venality of our carpet-bag government to force the national Republican party to repudiate it, and side with the colored men and the taxpaying whites against it, you will then acknowledge that those forty soldiers at the Custom-house have won a bloodless victory for the cause of genuine liberty, second only in importance to the taking of Vicksburg or the surrender of Lee.

A CARPET-BAGGER.

NEW ORLEANS, August 28, 1871.

Notes.

Two prolific New England families, the Lymans and the Howes, have lately held reunions at the homes of their forefathers, in pursuance of a custom which may now almost be called time-honored, and which will certainly be confirmed by these rather notable observances of it. The origin of this (if we are not mistaken) peculiarly Yankee notion is doubtless traceable to the genealogies and town histories upon which

New Englanders have bestowed unparalleled industry and research. But these have only fostered a feeling which must have existed previously, and by virtue of which two men of the same name could not meet each other without enquiring into their relationship, and doing their best to connect themselves with one or other of the four brothers (the Howe tradition variously gave from four to nine) who came over to this country from England. Doubtless, too, this feeling coexisted with a prejudice against giving publicity to family details, some of which were and deserved to remain family secrets, which no one would be justified in putting into print. The New England Historical and Genealogical Society encountered a great deal of this sort of opposition at the start, but the shelves of its library show how thoroughly it overcame it. The family conventions now go a step further, even, for a man may confess his kinship with another and see it published with indifference, and yet have a very decided objection to making his acquaintance or sitting under the same tent and at the same table with him, and celebrating the accident of a common name. No such scruples, apparently, marred the harmony of the two most recent gatherings, and we are bound to conclude that they were useful as social festivities, and as binding together by a natural and honorable tie those whom the great New England swarming has dispersed to all parts of the continent. We only regret that no appearance upon the scene was made by Mr. Wm. Parsons Lunt, of Boston, or his agent, offering for sale the very ingenious and too little known invention of Mr. Wm. H. Whitmore, called "Ancestral Tablets," the most tempting blank record ever devised to promote attention to genealogy. Mr. Lunt's limited edition could scarcely have satisfied the probable demand for this publication of his.

—Following the example of the other magazines, and "having considered the great number of requests which have been made for illustrated articles, and having already secured a number of competent artists," the *Overland* will in future be, to a greater or less extent, an illustrated magazine. The publishers intend to give pictures only of such places and objects as will have special interest for readers on both sides of the Atlantic. Inasmuch as California is rich in places, and objects, and personages which have special interest for outsiders, no requisite for the success of the new enterprise is wanting, except, first, the competent artists, about whom the publishers seem to be so sanguine; and then competent engravers, who shall not do what a large majority of our Eastern engravers do—spoil the artist's design, namely; and then competent printers, who shall not do as our Eastern printers do—assist the engravers to interpose thick darkness between the public and the artist. Take the best of our Eastern engravers, and much of an improvement as his work is over that of most of his brethren, he still runs the one ploughshare over everything in a way to agonize most artists. This is partly the artists' fault, to be sure, who will not be brought not to expect too much from engraving, nor to work for the block intelligently; but engravers and printers are largely to blame. The September *Overland*, in which we find this announcement—and which usually comes to hand a little late for notice with the other magazines—will be found pleasant and interesting. Mrs. Yelverton continues her account of the sisterhood among whom she lived while her husband was with his regiment before Sebastopol, and, although it is not to be called exciting, it may be read with pleasure, because of the fortunate subject, to say nothing of the interest attaching to the writer. "Shakes" is a proof of Mr. Bret Harte's popularity; but the imitation, while giving sufficient proof of that writer's imitableness, is but indifferent, and the story is poor. Its publication and the inferiority of the book-reviews show that the editorial work is done with less care than when Mr. Harte was the *Overland's* editor. Nevertheless, the magazine is, on the whole, and in its essential features, as worthy of attention as at any previous time. Senator Cole writes well about Turk's Island and the salt-makers; and Miss Josephine Clifford's description of her trip to Texas is agreeable reading. Some of the matter is distinctly padding; but "The Parks of London" and "Hobbies and their Riders" will nevertheless be liked a little, and in "Queer Sights and Ways in Peking" there is something new. An article concerning Puget Sound, another about "Captain Hall's Arctic Expedition," another about Brigham Young, and one entitled "An Ornithologist in Mexico," together with some verses, make up the magazine, which has, it will be seen, a varied table of contents, and may properly be commended as not bad reading for the railroad and steamboat. Those who are not tired of the Mormon question will find in the September *Harper's* a better article than the one in the *Overland*, though neither is good, both being obscure, and lacking in fulness as well as clearness. So far as we can make out, it yearly becomes plainer that the success of Mormonism is very

intimately connected with Brigham Young's continuance in life, and that, whether Young lives or dies, the prospect is good for its burial in the mines which are now rapidly opening in Utah. United States laws and officials, too, as well as the swarms of Gentile miners carried to Utah by the railroad, which has destroyed the isolation of the prophet, are assisting in the ruin of Young's polity, and some of his saints are in open rebellion against him. All signs indicate the speedy downfall of the system. The writer in the *Overland* is a woman, and, like other female observers in Utah, asserts the unhappiness of the Mormon women. It is, doubtless, too late to say anything to Mrs. S. M. B. Piatt as to her way of making her verses perfectly enigmatical. We defy any one to understand her poem in this *Overland*.

—John Lyly, or Lilly—whom most of our readers will know for his song of "Cupid and My Campaspe played at cards for kisses"—will be less known to some of them as the clever author of "Euphues, the Anatomy of Wit," and "Euphues and his England," than as the person whom Scott thought he was ridiculing when he depicted the fantastic and pedantically quaint courtier, Sir Piercie Shafton, and whom Shakespeare, it is commonly said, ridicules in his Don Adriano de Armado, in "Love's Labor Lost." A recent English work makes it doubtful if Shakespeare did not, on the contrary, much admire Lyly. Certainly, if imitation, which is held to be the most delicate flattery, because the sincerest, may be taken as evidence of admiration, Shakespeare thought well of Euphues. This is well pointed out by Mr. William Rushton, who, in his "Shakespeare's Euphuism," recently published by Longmans & Co., collates passages in the plays with parallel passages from Lyly's books. Thus, in the advice of Euphues to Philautus, Euphues says, "Be not lavish in thy tongue"; and Polonius says to Laertes in "Hamlet," "Give thy thoughts no tongue." Euphues says, "Be not quarrellous for every light occasion; they [the English] never fight without provoking, and once provoked, they never cease." Polonius says, "Beware of entrance to a quarrel; but being in, bear't that the opposed may beware of thee." Shakespeare was too good an Englishman to bestow the praise of never giving over on the French. Euphues says, "It shall there be better to hear what they say than to speak what thou thinkest"; and Polonius says, "Give every man thine ear, but few thy voice." In most of these cases, Shakespeare has clearly bettered his instruction, but as clearly he had it; and it was worth having.

—In all this there is nothing of Sir Piercie Shafton, nor of Armado. We may here remark that a far better critical opinion than that which identifies Lyly with Shakespeare's Don Adriano, makes the Don and likewise his companion in folly, the schoolmaster Holofernes, to be the caricature portraits of the "Resolute" John Florio, dictionary-maker, tutor, and courtier. As courtier he is the Don, as teacher Holofernes; and Shakespeare, it seems probable, brought his foolish figure on the stage less for anything truly valuable to a comedy-maker that he saw in him, than because Florio had seen fit to attack the English theatre. But in other parts of Lyly we may see, not indeed the utmost degree of the fault which Shakespeare satirized, but a degree of it which, when exaggerated by imitators of less brains than Lyly, would hardly be much caricatured in the speeches of the Don. Doubtless Lyly himself was disposed by nature and education to set manner above matter, and his inclination was increased by the rudeness of speech which he observed everywhere about him. Examples of his elaborate quaintness are well given by Dr. R. F. Weymouth, the author of a lecture entitled "On Euphuism"—published in London by Asher & Co.—who, says the *Pall Mall Gazette*, has discovered and made clear what Morley, Marsh, and Craik have failed to see—namely, that the special character of the antithesis which is a principal feature of Lyly's style, is the combination with it of artful alliteration, so as to make the corresponding word in the same clauses of his sentences begin with the same letter, thus producing "a transverse alliteration rather than longitudinal." For example, take a quotation from the title-page of "Euphues and his England": "Delightful to be read and nothing hurtful to be regarded, wherein there is small offence by lightness given to the wise and less occasion of looseness proffered to the wanton." Consonance also Lyly affected, as in *delightful, hurtful; lightness, looseness*. Far-fetched allusion was another thing that helped him to his ruin. For further specimens of Shakespeare's indebtedness to Lyly, compare his "Most subject is the fattest soil to weeds," with Lyly's saying that "the fattest ground brings forth nothing but weeds." This, to be sure, might well be a common proverb. But hardly so in this case: Shakespeare says, "Far from her nest the lapwing cries away"; Lyly, "The lapwing flyeth, with a false cry far from their (the young lapwings') nest." "One drop of poison disperseth itself into every vein," says Lyly; Shakespeare has it,

"A dram of poison will disperse itself through all the veins"; Lyly, "Women either love entirely or hate deadly"; Shakespeare, "If she did not hate him deadly she would love him dearly." Both Mr. Rushton's and Doctor Weymouth's works will be welcomed—the one more warmly, perhaps, by the strictly Shakspearian scholar, but both by the general student of literature.

—Mr. Rushton's book above mentioned will rouse in some minds the question of how far authors are justified in taking other men's thoughts and expressions and using them as if their own. Saying that "wherever he found anything addressed to William Shakespeare he took it without scruple," or that "Molière took his own goods wherever he found them," is to say the truth, no doubt, but still leaves us without a rule for trying the merits of a case of plagiarism. Take, for instance, Mr. Charles Reade's case. The plot of his recent novel he got, as a correspondent of the *Nation* has shown, from a forgotten English novel. A correspondent of the *Times* has shown, that all of Mr. Reade's curious description of a machine for governing the thoughts and feelings of distant persons whom the malignant owners of the machine might wish to torture, he has simply "lifted" from a book written by a real lunatic, who published his crazy dream in London some years ago. No wonder the *Athenaeum's* critic found this part of "A Terrible Temptation" very creditable to Mr. Reade's imaginative power, and almost as if it had been written by a madman. Still another correspondent writes to us, that all that portion of Mr. Reade's novel called "Put Yourself in his Place" which details the breaking of a dam and [the rush of the water down a valley which it devastates in its course, preceded by a wild cry of warning, closely resembles a passage in a novel written years ago by still another author, and republished last year by Harper & Brothers, under a title changed from something else to "A Beggar on Horseback." And so of others of his books. Now, was it right for Mr. Reade to put himself into such a position as to get credit for abilities which he may or may not possess? This is what he did when he eviscerated the madman's book. May we "convey" from everybody except those so rich that we cannot ruin them by our filching? May we take what we like, on condition only that we make a better use of it than the original owner? Something like this last would seem to be the rule; the penalty for violating it perhaps being that, by-and-by, some one comes, points out your borrowings, and shows that, no matter how great you may be, you are no miracle; that there are no independent fountains in the history of the human intellect, but rather a continuous stream, fed by rain-drops and every little brook that evaporation and condensation feed; that the makers of moralities, and the interlude-makers, and the playwrights, and euphuists, and novelists, and a people hungry for drama and a time favorable to its production, must first exist and work and unite before a Shakespeare for instance is possible.

—The speeches at the Scott celebration in Edinburgh were not particularly felicitous, but were fairly good; as good as was to be expected. Sir William Maxwell-Stirling spoke to the toast of the evening in a set oration, too biographical and full of details, but in which was collected some information not very generally known. Thus, he stated that when land is to be sold in any district of the Scott countries [in Great Britain, we presume], the novelist's scenes and characters therewith connected, and even his passing allusions, are carefully chronicled in the advertisements, and duly inventoried in the title-deeds of the estate. On coming to speak of the voluminousness of Scott's works, and the rapidity and ease with which he wrote, the orator remarked that two acute and competent observers, Hazlitt, the critic, and Captain Basil Hall, were inclined to attribute to him something of supernatural power—an assertion which, as oratorical, we may suffer to pass, especially as the orator added that Captain Hall, who kept a copious diary, observed that once, when at Abbotsford, he himself wrote in a day about as much manuscript as Scott considered a fair day's work, and so ceased to marvel. Quality, however, as well as quantity, Captain Hall should have taken into account. As Scott once said to his amanuensis, Willie Laidlaw—who, in his impatience to hear what was coming, would say, "Come, sir, get on, get on!"—"Hout, Willie, ye forget I have to invent the story." It is true that much of Scott's English is the English of dictation, and not of careful composition, and that James Ballantyne was a proof-reader out of ten thousand and very serviceable to his great friend, but still neither in matter nor manner were the novels, even as first written, very much like Captain Hall's "copious journals." Sir William went on to speak of Scott's personal character, justly remarking that the long story of his life adds no incident to the quarrels of authors, and doubted if the whole "Biographie Universelle" could furnish a single name which would show so fair, if the life belonging to it

were all unrolled year by year, as Scott's has been. We do, in fact, know more about Scott, told by more people of various kinds, than of any other of our authors, unless, by possibility, we are to except Johnson. He concluded by recalling to the minds of his audience that within the lifetime of Scott died Clive and Hastings, the founders of the British Empire in India; Chatham, the great minister; Pitt, "the pilot who weathered the storm," and Fox, his great rival, the English Demosthenes; Nelson, the great admiral, and Wellington; Burke, Canning, and a host of poets, scholars, philosophers, and inventors, and that of all these only two had been thought worthy of national recognition, both Scotchmen, Burns and Scott—a statement naturally received with much cheering. Sir William was followed by the Lord-Justice Clerk, who occupied most of his time in comparing Scotch humor with English, and said, among other things, that Sydney Smith's assertion that a surgical operation was necessary if a joke were to be got into a Scotchman's head, was "a good jest, indeed," coming from a man who had dined with Scott and Wilson, and suggested that the scalpel was necessary only when the joke was an English joke. This retort, by the way, is not a bad specimen of the Scottish jest, which is very apt to have for its characteristic feature more or less brutality of attack on some one of whom it is designed to get the better. A Scotch joke that hurts no one's feelings is comparatively a rare thing. This sardonic and somewhat cruel character of Scotch wit, and the matter-of-fact literalness of the Scotch mind, it was that Smith, whose own humor was delightfully playful and sunny, in all probability had in view when he made his criticism—a criticism fully confirmed by the other great humorist of the period, Charles Lamb. Wilson, to be sure, could be riotously humorous, and his Ettrick Shepherd is certainly a fine humorous creation. But it by no means pleased the Shepherd, we are to remember; and Mrs. Hogg's appreciation of it, and her dislike of that way of treating "Mr. Hogg," were characteristically Scotch, solemn and literal. Then we are to remember, too, how large a part of Wilson's recorded humor and wit—and Burns's too, for that matter—is directed against his political and other enemies. Neither the playfulness and subtleness nor the charity of the English humor, nor the archness, breadth, and grotesqueness of Irish humor, are very large constituent parts of the humor of the more prosaic fellow-subjects of the Irishman and Englishman.

—Sir William Maxwell-Stirling's statement of the fact that of all their distinguished contemporaries, only Scott and Burns, both Scotchmen, were deemed worthy of national commemoration—which is, of course, to be understood of commemoration by centennial banquets—has set the English papers to discussing why it should be that the Scott celebration was so much colder an affair than the Burns celebration, and they put forth various reasons. One says that in politics Scott was a hard Tory, and, in point of religion, was a churchman, and that he thus lost much of the liking of the vast majority of his countrymen. The same writer argues that the prevailing impression made by the story of Scott's life is a melancholy one, he having entirely failed to realize the object of his ambition, and found a county family, and having been killed by his attempts to pay heavy debts incurred in a scheme more romantic than wise. Another favors the opinion that Scott himself was of a melancholy cast of mind, and points out the numerous passages in the novels and the poems where he dwells on death—by preference, to be sure, on the externals of death; as hearse, the appearance of the grave, the trappings and observances of funerals, the mourning of the relatives. It cites many passages, though it omits one of the best—as being poetical and beautiful, as well as very suggestive of the sadness of death—the poem beginning,

"Proud Maisie in yonder wood
Walking so early,"

and the showing which the writer makes for his case is not unimpressive. Claverhouse, too, with his expressed inability to understand how men should make so much account of life, and the taking of life, is another strong witness for our writer, for certainly that view is not an unmelancholy one. Still, however fond Scott may have been of the Gothic glooms of death, and its outward pomps, it will be difficult to persuade people that his poetry and fiction are not cheerful, the reverse of depressing, and that they do not in this reflect faithfully his own disposition and habit of mind. So it seems to us. A truer explanation than any of these of the fact that Burns calls out a greater degree of enthusiasm than Scott—for that it is a fact must, no doubt, be admitted—we take to be that the enthusiasm for Burns is in large part called out of other people than the more literate and restrained classes who make the majority of Scott's admirers. This the *Spectator* very well points out. At "Burns Celebrations," so far as we know them in this country, the admirers of the poet as-

sembled to do him honor would, at least, not object very strongly, nor, in deed, think it at all strange, if a good majority of the company present were to go home a little drunk, and singing, "Willie brewed a peck o' maut." It is further to be said that no doubt Burns's strength as well as his weaknesses are nearer to the popular heart, and to the universal heart—appeal more strongly to the affections, than the strength and weaknesses of Scott. To be a great story-teller, and to have a weakness for building a castellated Gothic mansion and founding a county family, is to be further from the popular heart than to have a gift of writing the tenderest songs of simple affection, and the warmest and archest songs of gallantry, and the most singable of headlong bacchanalian songs. To be a master of coarse and stinging satire for hypocritical and pharisaic godliness; to have the humor of "Tam O'Shanter" and the untheological piety of the "Cot-tar's Saturday Night"; to have at once the kind-heartedness of the "Lines to a Mouse," the somewhat too aggressive independence of "A Man's a Man for a' that," the patriotic fervor of "Scots Wha Ha'e," the healthy pensiveness of sentiment of "Auld Lang Syne," the tender purity of the verses "To Mary in Heaven," and, furthermore, to have habits of drunkenness, of indiscriminate fondness for "the lasses," and of ready good-fellowship, is certainly to be surer of a centennial celebration of one's birthday, and, perhaps, to deserve it better—for the value of centennial celebrations is not a precisely ascertained matter—than to have been a world-renowned teller of historical romances and popular tales, and a man of pure life and business habits.

—The well-known geographer, H. Kiepert, contributes to the last number of the Berlin *Zeitschrift für Erdkunde* an article on the exchange of territory by which, in the final peace negotiations, Germany ceded back to France a large part of the Haut-Rhin Department adjoining Belfort, and gained a small portion of the Brieux arrondissement adjoining Luxemburg. Incidentally, he has something of interest to say on the question, How should the Germans henceforth denominate the duchy just mentioned, and how their new boundary, the Vosges Mountains? It appears from his discussion of the name that Luxemburg in its earliest form (963) was Lucilinburg, later (1065) Liutzelburg, the *iu* of the first syllable being equivalent to *li*, meaning the little town—the adjective being still better preserved in a small railroad station not far from Pfalz-burg, viz., Lützelberg. German books were printed at Lutzenburg after 1598, at Lützelburg after 1623; and as late as 1795 the latter was the only official form under both the Spanish and Austrian régimes. The French form Luxembourg is as old as 1451, and it survived the political changes of 1839, which re-established the connections of the duchy with Germany. Herr Kiepert is strongly in favor of at least retaining the *li*, if no part else of the ancient name. As for Vogesen, he declares it a monstrous perversion of the original appellation of the Vosges Mountains—seeming to add a German plural in *en* to the French plural in *es*. He would lay stress upon the short syllable in the Celtic Roman form *Vosagus* or *Vosagus*, and the German name he pronounces in favor of is either the *Wasgauisches Gebirge* or simply the *Wasgenwald*. For his part, he has for years suppressed on his maps the bastard word *Vogesen*. It dates, by the way, from the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, and was the creation of false scholarship, not a popular outgrowth.

THE EARLY WRITINGS OF JANE AUSTEN.*

A YEAR or two ago we had occasion to review the memoir of Jane Austen, just then published by her nephew, the Rev. J. E. Austen-Leigh, the present Vicar of Bray. In that work he told us of certain early writings of Miss Austen, which she had thought unworthy of publication, but which were still extant in manuscript. Her numerous admirers, on both sides of the Atlantic—more enthusiastic than numerous—were eagerly curious to see these first attempts of so remarkable a genius, and, by private letter and through the press, their wishes were urged warmly upon her excellent biographer, who has now kindly yielded to them. He has lately published a new edition of the memoir—slightly enlarged—and added to it the fragments in question, together with a short but complete story entitled "Lady Susan." It is not likely that any of the devotees of the Austen faith expected that these juvenile productions should be equally perfect with the works she had finished to her own contentment and sent into the world. If they were thus unreasonable, they will have been disappointed by the granting of their prayers. But if they only looked for the first sprightly runnings of her exquisite fancy and the earliest pro-

* "A Memoir of Jane Austen. By her Nephew, J. Austen-Leigh." Second edition. To this is added "Lady Susan," and fragments of two other unfinished tales, by Miss Austen. London: Bentley.

mise of her inimitable artistic touch, they will thank Mr. Austen-Leigh for the gift he has bestowed upon them and upon the world. Their absolute merit is certainly but moderate; but, considered as the first trials of the pencil of so wonderful a painter of the scenes and people of daily life, they certainly possess a very high degree of interest.

The suppressed chapter of "Persuasion," containing the *denouement* of that admirable novel as originally drafted, is altogether the most interesting of these remains. We think it furnishes, in connection with the conclusion which replaces it in the published work, a most satisfactory refutation of the suggestion that this exquisite fiction betrays symptoms of failing mental as well as bodily conditions. In our judgment, there is no part of any of Miss Austin's novels that shows stronger marks of the hand of the consummate artist than the winding up of "Persuasion," and the natural yet unexpected way in which the hero and heroine come out of complications in which they have been entangled, and into the understanding which happily concludes the whole matter. The change from her first plan which is now made known to us shows that, in this last effort of her genius, her imagination was as vivid and her judgment as true as at any previous period of her authorship. As originally planned, the conclusion was briefly this. Admiral Croft meets Anne Elliot the morning after the concert, and prevails on her to call on his wife—reluctantly, from the fear that Captain Wentworth may be with his sister. The Admiral assures her that Mrs. Croft is alone, not considering his brother-in-law as anybody to be excepted. Captain Wentworth is there, and is employed by the Admiral to inform Anne that if the report be true that she is going to marry her cousin, Mr. Elliot, he will cheerfully surrender the lease of Kellynch, as he supposes they would wish to live there. The long-estranged lovers are left together. The first question leads to a denial of any intention of marrying Mr. Elliot, on which hint Captain Wentworth speaks, and all goes well. Any one familiar with the closing chapters of the book as they stand will see how much would have been lost had it ended thus—the visit of the Musgraves to Bath, the scenes at the White Hart, the conversation of Captain Harville and Anne, which led to the renewed offer of Wentworth—and we are sure will feel with us that the near approach of death had thrown no shadow over the brilliant mind of Jane Austen.

We think no one would have augured her great success as a painter of common life from any of the other of these sketches. "Lady Susan," which is hardly a sketch, being a completed picture of small size, is entirely unworthy of Miss Austen's hand. Had it been the last, instead of one of the earliest of her attempts, it might have given color to the suggestion that her mind had suffered as well as her body from the inroads of consumption. It is thoroughly unpleasant in its characters and its details, and worked out with none of the skill that conceals itself which was Miss Austen's eminent gift. Lady Susan is heartless, cruel, tyrannical, coarse, with no redeeming qualities, and there is no life or color in any of the subordinate characters. The unchristened sketch, which Mr. Austen-Leigh calls "The Watsons," from the name of the family of the heroine, contains some glimpses of the talent which developed itself later, but only glimpses, and none that would suggest the promise of its later fulness. The editor infers from the date of the water-mark of the paper of the manuscript that it must have been written early in this century, and, consequently, after "Pride and Prejudice," "Sense and Sensibility," and "Northanger Abbey." We think that Miss Austen must have copied it at that time from an earlier draft, as it is hardly possible that these pale phantoms, with their bald and stilted talk, could have issued from a brain which had created the flesh-and-blood creatures, living, moving, and speaking like men and women of this world, that she has made the companions and friends of her readers for life. She probably perceived how inferior the workmanship of these juvenile productions was to that of the works she had completed, and wisely relegated them to her desk as unworthy to see the light. "The Watsons" contains perhaps a suggestion of Mrs. Elton, possibly of Mr. Woodhouse and of Frank Churchill, but one that only suggests the vast difference between the earliest conception and the finished portraiture. But while we regard these *juvenilia* of Miss Austen as thus inferior to her finished works, we would not imply that her nephew erred in giving them to the world. The fame of his immortal relative is too well established to be affected by the proof that her genius was of a gradual development, while her good judgment and good sense are shown in her perfect appreciation of the relative merits of her writings. She is not one of those perverse geniuses that persist in thinking the most rickety and worst-conditioned of their literary offspring the strongest and the comeliest of them all. In common with the other admirers of Miss

Austen, we desire to thank Mr. Austen-Leigh for the sight he has given us of the first efforts of her infant genius, as a part of his most interesting sketch of her life and character.

Miss Austen's literary fate was an odd one. Though all her novels, excepting "Persuasion" and "Northanger Abbey," were published during her lifetime—"Sense and Sensibility" six years before her death—her fame may almost be said to have been a posthumous one. Her works brought her little of the general notoriety and none of the famous friends which had rewarded the efforts of far inferior and now almost forgotten authoresses. The popular reputation and great acquaintances which their works brought to Hannah More, to Miss Brunton, to the Porters, to Mrs. Opie, as well as to Fanny Burney and Miss Edgeworth, were not hers. She must have been gratified by the review of her first novels in the *Quarterly*, though she probably never knew that it was written by Walter Scott, one of the earliest and warmest of her admirers. This was the only high tribute to her genius from the literary world; and from the great world that of the Prince Regent—who sent her word that he had a copy of her work at each of his residences, and offered her his permission to dedicate "Emma" to himself—is the only one which we know of her receiving in her lifetime. Ever since her reputation has been growing and spreading, and she has long been recognized by the highest authorities, as well as by widespread popular admiration, as one of the immortals. If she had not at any one time as wide a circle of readers as some of her sensational sisters, we will venture to say that none of them has had so many, on the whole, or of so high a quality. Scott, Archbishop Whately (who also reviewed her), Sir James Mackintosh, Southey, Coleridge, Guizot, Macaulay (who once intended writing her life), Whewell, Sydney Smith, Chief-Justice Marshall, and Judge Story, are a few of the men of the highest eminence on both sides of the Atlantic who delighted in her works and helped to confirm her fame. For fertility of invention, for variety and individuality of characterization, for simplicity and naturalness of her plots, which yet are not discovered till she gives the key, for dramatic development of her characters, for the power of describing without description by incidental hints and touches; in short, for that perfection of artifice which conceals itself and seems nothing but the simplicity of nature and the necessary course of events, there is no story-teller that we know of that surpasses Jane Austen. Her stories never tire, and are as fresh in interest on the fiftieth reading as on the first, and her characters are as much actual entities to us as our own acquaintances, and much more so than most personages in history. Whatever gives us a more intimate knowledge of such an enchantress in her private life, and the method and beginnings of her art, is a favor for which we are grateful, and for which we desire again to acknowledge our obligations to the author and editor of this most interesting book.

THE MUTINEERS OF THE BOUNTY.*

BETWEEN the islands of the Northern and of the Southern Pacific Ocean, in corresponding latitudes, a surprising similarity of climate, flora, fauna, inhabitants, languages, and customs exists. After sailing southward many weeks in a great circle crossing the equator, one may, on stepping ashore in a Southern Pacific group, take up the thread of aboriginal speech with the natives in almost the same dialect as that of the islands which one has left more than three thousand miles behind. From the Ladrões to Easter Island, a distance of nine thousand miles, and from Hawaii to New Zealand, an arc measured at right angles to the foregoing one, and more than half as long, the language and the race of the islanders are substantially the same in all the countless Pacific groups. After the first classification of these islands, into coral and volcanic formations, they may be said to differ hardly otherwise than as the climate varies in different parts of this vast area, which equals in extent that of all the continents of the globe.

Pitcairn's Island, upon which the mutineers of the *Bounty* landed in 1789, lies but a little further south of the line than the Hawaiian Islands lie to the north of it; and therefore, as we have intimated, repeats, but on a smaller scale, most of the physical features of that group. The climate has the same delicious and uniform temperature—the extremes in either case being 60° and 85° Fahrenheit. The list of indigenous plants is almost the same for either country. Hawaii and Pitcairn's Island had in common, when discovered, the cocoa nut, the banana, the yam, the sweet-

* "The Mutineers of the *Bounty*, and their Descendants in Pitcairn and Norfolk Islands." By Lady Belcher. New York: Harper & Brothers, 1871.
 "The Eventful History of the Mutiny and Piratical Seizure of H. M. S. *Bounty*. By Sir John Barrow." London, 1839.
 "Narrative of the Mutiny of the *Bounty*, on a Voyage to the South Seas. By Lieut. W. Bligh, Commander."

potato, the *arum esculentum* or taro, the cloth mulberry, the candle-nut tree, the *ti* plant (*Dracaena terminalis*), the *nono* (*Morinda citrifolia*), the Chinese mulberry, and the *pandanus odoratissimus*. In compensation for its want of the Hawaiian bread-fruit, Pitcairn's Island had the banyan, which Hawaii lacked. To both countries the water-melon, the potato, lemons, oranges, tobacco, sugar-cane, turmeric, and the ordinary garden vegetables of the temperate zone have been introduced by foreigners. In both countries a profusion of fruit and vegetables supplies an abundant diet at very small expense of labor. The domestic animals were few in number at Pitcairn's Island; goats, pigs, and poultry, which the colonists brought with them from Tahiti, were abundant; but the stalwart islanders, on the arrival of Sir Thomas Staines in 1814, were alarmed at the sight of a cow; while they very intelligently admired a little black terrier, to them an entirely novel sight. "I know that it is a dog," said Edward Young, naively, "I have read of such things."

The experiment of this plantation in the Pacific derives a peculiar interest from the fact that the soil and climate of the island—the entire physical environment of the human germ there planted—was nearly the same as that of other islands; while yet that germ remained long undisturbed, and multiplied with hardly any interference of other blood. For twenty years, its very existence was unknown to the world. For sixty years, the strain remained almost absolutely the same as at the first landing upon Pitcairn's Island. It was as if a scientific man had planned and directed this novel experiment in stirpiculture. As a preliminary to pointing out certain little-noticed features of this experiment, it may be necessary to remind the reader of certain points in its history.

The mutiny of the *Bounty* occurred in April, 1789, after its crew had indulged in half a year's intercourse with the kindly Tahitians. The fugitive company, twenty-seven in number—nine white men, six Polynesian men, and twelve Polynesian women—reached Pitcairn's Island, an uninhabited rock in the South Pacific, late in the same year. Here they lived peaceably until 1791, when mortal quarrels for the possession of the women commenced. There were massacres for two years, when (October, 1793, according to the statement quoted by Sir John Barrow) all of the men were killed except four whites; ten of the women surviving. The women preferred the whites, and took part with them in destroying their own countrymen. From 1793 until the close of the century, when John Adams was left the sole surviving mutineer upon the island, they lived promiscuously with the men, "frequently changing their abode from one house to another" (Barrow). M'Koy died in 1798; in 1799, Quintal perished by the hands of Adams and Young; in 1800, Young died, and left John Adams, then thirty-six years of age, the last man upon Pitcairn's Island.

This year marked a new era in the history of the island. Adams then, according to the later testimony of the islanders, reformed his character and his conduct. The conversion was, as far as we can learn, not less genuine than sudden. He made himself the guardian and teacher of this community of women and children; he introduced the rites of the Church of England among his flock; and when the lads attained the age of twenty, and the girls of eighteen, he solemnized marriages between them. The social transformation was complete. There was never a more innocent, orderly, and virtuous community than this one speedily became. Almost in an instant the turbid solution changed into the clear crystallization of a blameless social life.

Pitcairn's Island held its secret until the grandchildren of the first colonists began to appear. Then—in 1808—Captain Folger of Nantucket discovered its strange history. In 1814, Staines and Pipon, of the Royal Navy, visited it and described its innocence and its rapid growth. Beechey found Pitcairn's Island an uncontaminated paradise in 1825. No foreigner, indeed, was admitted to its settlement until the years between 1823 and 1828, when three Englishmen of good character were permitted to make their homes there. After about a year's residence they married; and their descendants mingled with the Island race. In March, 1830, Captain Waldegrave found the colony numbering seventy-nine souls. Its blood, however, was still the same as at the outset; and they presented for study the strangest phenomena, the most curious material for physiological research and speculation.

The more noticeable points of this case, as we are able to educe them by comparison of the separate accounts, written by no scientific hands, we may now state as follows:

1. The members of the Pitcairn's Island community were related more closely to each other than those of any other community, of equal age and number, of which we have any authentic account. All were descended

from a few pairs; the children of Adam and Eve could hardly have bred "in and in" more closely. It is much to be regretted that we have not the genealogical record of each individual in this community. But we have sufficient evidence, 2, of the stability of the cross between the English and the Polynesian race. Could we attain all the facts of the case (an undertaking which we commend to Mr. Darwin—Rev. E. H. Nobbs, of Norfolk Island, could furnish records of parentage and of birth), we are confident that they would throw much light upon the still-vexed questions relating to hybridity. Certain it is that the union of the two has produced a cross that is both remarkably healthy and fertile in itself. We have found no evidence that would explain this fertility, as happens in a large class of hybrids, by the fact of union with the parent stocks.

3. The dominance of the Saxon nature over the savage was illustrated in Pitcairn's Island in some novel ways. That the Englishmen, who induced the islanders to accompany them into their exile as friends, should have converted them soon into slaves, and finally succeeded in destroying them all, is what we might have expected from our knowledge of the comparative prepotency of the races. Nor is it surprising that the Tahitian women, in the strife of which they were the cause, should have sided with the stronger and more desirable whites. But that nine Englishmen, sexually balanced against eighteen Polynesian men and women, should have impressed their own language and religion upon the descendants of this unequal ancestry, and so much of what was best in their own intellectual and physical character that visitors to the island found the grandchildren of the colony, in spite of their savage dress and surroundings, much more English than Tahitian in character, is a result for which we may elsewhere look in vain among the records of human descent.

4. The elimination, in their seclusion from the competitive struggles of the world, of what we may call the defensive forces of character was strikingly shown in a later period of the Pitcairn's Islanders' history. In 1832, an adventurer, named Joshua Hill, landed upon the island, pretending to come from England as its appointed ruler. He had neither credentials nor commission; yet he was able to establish a most cruel and oppressive rule over this hitherto happy community. He expelled the three Englishmen who had lately come there—among them Mr. Nobbs, who, since the death of John Adams, the reformed mutineer, in 1829, had been the valued pastor and teacher of the little community. It was one man against a hundred; and by force of cunning the single rascal won an easy supremacy. We know that he flogged and beat the white inhabitants at his will; how much further his brutalities went we are not informed; but it was six years before the British Government, in 1838, interposed and removed this wretched old man, the Island incubus. His career might well serve for the text of a discourse upon the helplessness of innocence.

The whites now returned to Pitcairn's Island, and years of uninterrupted prosperity and growth followed. But the community found itself at last too large for the little island, but four square miles in extent, that formed its home. In 1856, after much debate, the people emigrated *en masse* to Norfolk Island, three thousand miles to the west of Pitcairn's; and there they still remain, excepting two families, who, driven by an insufferable home-sickness, have returned to repeople Pitcairn's Island.

Enough has now been said to indicate the unique nature of this self-determined experiment in human descent. A novel character has appeared as the result. The Norfolk Islanders of to-day are still nearly the same people as when they left Pitcairn's Island. They have increased in number to three hundred; but there have been few marriages among them save with members of their own community. They possess the physical characters of their English and Tahitian ancestry in almost equal part; they have the same light-olive complexion, the slightly flattened nose and full lips, and the elastic and vigorous physique which we have observed among the half-breeds of the Northern Pacific Islands. On the other hand, they have a more than monastic ignorance of the world, and a considerably more than English delicacy of conscience. Sir John Barrow relates that one of the girls having incautiously refused a lover, and relented, languished for years before she could consent to break her vow not to marry him. This weighty case was submitted to a sort of naval court of love, composed of Captain Beechey's officers, who encouraged the girl in vain to act according to her inclination in the matter. Another mental characteristic of this community was lack of humor among its members. The Pitcairn's Islanders were unable to jest or to perceive the point of a joke, and considered that they had been trifled with on discovering that strangers had used words to them in any other than their literal meanings. The same deficient sensibility may be observed in other small

and carefully trained communities in the same part of the world, as among the children of the missionaries in many of the Pacific stations. But if the Pitcairners did not understand wit, they always avoided scandal-mongering.

Captain Bligh's book is an attempt to exonerate himself from the charge, well proved by all other accounts of the mutiny, of brutality toward his crew. We should say unexampled brutality but for the constant reports in the daily papers, which show too clearly that the cruel treatment of sailors, at least in the merchant service, is still as frequent and shameful as in the time of Bligh. The landsman knows little of the amount and character of this cruelty. Sir John Barrow's book is the most valuable for the student of the history of Pitcairn's Island. He gives some important facts which Lady Belcher, with a squeamishness that is rather American than English, has omitted; as where she neglects to tell us that twelve Tahitian women were of the party that landed upon Pitcairn's Island. In her book we notice, too, an occasional inaccuracy in the statement of dates, as in those assigned to the landing of the second colonists; and there is a slip in her criticism of a Polynesian prefix wrongly used in the name "Otaheite." The prefix *O* does not have in the Polynesian languages, as Lady Belcher says it has, the force of the genitive; it has a peculiar significance which we do not here expound, and is known as the "demonstrative particle." But we cannot expect Lady Belcher to be familiar with the niceties of the grammar of Tahiti. Her work, as a whole, is the most important upon this subject, as it is the only one that brings the history of the colony down to a recent date; and we can commend it as very interesting reading.

Le Mouvement Socialiste et l'Economie Politique. Par H. Dameth. (Paris, 1869.)—The author of this short work was at one time a socialist, and, as his conversion was the work of his intelligence and not of enthusiasm, he is able to explain in a perfectly lucid manner both his former views and those he now holds. The importance of his subject cannot be denied. It would be more agreeable to avoid thinking of so complicated a question as this of labor, but it presses on for a solution, and what ignorance and fanaticism are capable of making of it this last year has shown. M. Dameth's book is a *résumé* of a course of lectures delivered by him at Lyons, under the auspices of the Chamber of Commerce and of the *Société d'Economie Politique* of that city. He himself is the Professor of Political Economy at the Academy of Geneva. His book contains less than one hundred and fifty pages, a brief compendium of which we will try to set before our readers.

According to M. Dameth's analysis, socialism as a theory is, in the first place, a criticism of the existing social order, which convinces the socialist that the rich live at the expense of the poor. To this it is answered that inequality of conditions rises normally and justly from the inequality of forces and the services rendered to society, and from the inequality of the power of saving and preserving. This inequality of conditions, so far from entailing the exploitation of labor by capital, is rather profitable to all as the principle of the formation and preservation of capital, the instrument of general production. The inequality of conditions which arises from legal privileges contrary to the common right, on account of their being established for the advantage of certain social classes or special interests, is, however, a factitious aggrandizement of this natural inequality. The socialist says, "If this inequality is once established, the exploitation necessarily follows." "No," says the political economist, "the fortunes which are amassed take nothing from the poor; on the contrary, contact with them is more beneficial for the latter than the contact with poverty. As to the abuses, they are to be seen in poverty as well as in opulence. The workman can waste his salary as well as the capitalist his profits. Moreover, fortune surely comes to the most deserving and most economical."

In the second place, the general principles of reform which are advanced by socialism pretend to be the result of the modern democratic spirit. Political economy denies this. Modern democracy has only one valid definition—the reign of right. But the root of all rights is personal liberty. True democracy is, then, the antipodes of despotism, even if it be exercised in the name of the people. Now socialism bases all its reforms on this sort of despotism. Not believing in the natural harmony of interests, it seeks to rectify them by the force of authority; it demands that the law of supply and demand should be replaced by arbitrary tariffs, to the advantage of some and to the harm of others. It wishes to

absorb everything into the hands of the state; in short, it sacrifices real equality, that of common rights and personal liberty, to the absolute equality of different parts; it suppresses all individual merit and responsibility.

Socialism bases itself on these two propositions: First, all social suffering is caused by that inequality of conditions which arises from the mutual antagonism of interests. Second, this antagonism can only be destroyed by the complete solidarization of interests; that is to say, the absorption of the particular by the general interest.

Finally, M. Dameth remarks that the history of Communism, showing its existence in Greece and Rome, among the Jews and at the foundation of Christianity, proves satisfactorily how ancient and deep-rooted a theory it is. Judging from its recent manifestations, the observer might suppose it to be only of modern growth; in fact, however, it has been for many ages the steady foe of individual development, the unrelenting enemy of the chief means of civilization.

Pioneer Biography. Sketches of the Lives of some of the Early Settlers of Butler County, Ohio. By James McBride, of Hamilton. Vol. II. (Cincinnati: Robert Clarke & Co.)—This well-printed and carefully edited volume will prove helpful to any student of American history for the period included between the years 1790 and 1812. The most interesting of the thirteen biographies it contains are those which relate to the memorable defeat of St. Clair, in November, 1791, and the subsequent victorious campaign of Gen. Wayne, whose men, "it may be said, fought in the last battle of the Revolutionary struggle." This able soldier held the strictly military view of the proper mode of dealing with the Indians, and it was a view which had its justification at that time in the fact that the Indians were encouraged in their hostilities by the British, and therefore were not fit subjects for negotiation calculated for the savage character when left to its own counsels, or for such progress in the settlement of the country as makes resistance madness and clearly madness. "About this time [spring of 1793], it is stated in the notice of Isaac Paxton, 'General Wayne received a letter from the secretary of war, proposing the appointment of commissioners to treat with the Indians; to which the General replied, that 'he desired to be present at the convention, with twenty-five hundred of his commissioners, with not a Quaker among them,' and added, that if such was the case he felt confident an honorable peace would be the result." The Quaker commissioner may very well appear on the scene when the odds are thirty-nine million to three hundred thousand against the red man, and when, shift his camp as he may, he finds in the morning that the railroad surveyor and the miner have run their lines through it overnight. Humanity towards the Indians in these circumstances, though the plainest duty, is no longer a merit in us, since to make war on them is as cowardly as it is cruel. Nevertheless, it is a moral progress we have made in this matter, and part of the same that has rendered flogging in the army obsolete, and abolished slavery. Wayne's quartermaster could write to the military storekeeper at Pittsburgh: "Please send down some whip cord for cats; they have no cats to whip the men with."

Colonel Matthew Hueston having been born near Mercersburg, Pa., gives his biographer an excuse for mentioning the origin of a more famous character:

"About three miles in a northwest direction from Mercersburg, there is a wild, romantic gorge in the Cove Mountain. Within this gorge, the old road leads up through a narrow secluded cove or glen, encircled on every side by high and rugged mountains. Here, at the foot of a toilsome ascent in the road, which the old traders called 'The Stony Battery,' some sixty years ago, stood two log-cabins, in one of which a Scotchman of the name of Buchanan dwelt, and in the other had a small store, where he drove a profitable traffic with the Indian traders and frontiersmen who came down the mountain pass; exchanging with them powder, salt, iron, firearms, sugar, blankets, and cloths for the furs and peltries of the hunters and trappers, and the 'old Monongahela whiskey' of the backwoodsmen.

"The old Scotch trader had a son, named James, born here, and cradled amid these wild scenes of nature and the rude din of frontier life. The father prospered in trade, and after a few years removed into the town of Mercersburg, where he assumed a higher rank in business. He opened a respectable store, and was a justice of the peace. He sent his son James to Dickinson College, Carlisle, where he graduated in 1809. He then studied law, and commenced the practice in Lancaster, Pa. We afterwards find him among the most accomplished, eloquent, and distinguished members of the United States Senate, Minister Plenipotentiary to the Court of St. James, and, in 1857, President of the United States."

NEW AUTUMN BOOKS.

HURD & HOUGHTON,

13 ASTOR PLACE, NEW YORK,

THE RIVERSIDE PRESS, CAMBRIDGE, MASS.,

Will publish this week,

I.

PICTURES OF TRAVEL IN SWEDEN, among the Hartz Mountains, and in Switzerland; with a Visit at Charles Dickens's House. By Hans Christian Andersen. In 1 vol. crown 8vo, cloth, \$1 75.

This volume completes the series of Andersen's Writings (10 volumes, \$18 75) issued by arrangement with the author.

II.

THE LAST KNIGHT: A Romance Garland.

From the German of Anastasius Grün. Translated, with Notes, by John O. Sargent. In 1 vol. 4to, \$2 50.

"The Last Knight" is a series of ballads founded on incidents in the life of the Emperor Maximilian I., and forming a national poem which has given the author his chief and deserved celebrity.

III.

THE FABLES OF PILPAY. Copiously illustrated. In 1 vol. 16mo, \$1 50.

This edition of Pilpay's Fables, the first issued in America, is uniform with Hurd & Houghton's edition of *Æsop*.

The ancient and widespread popularity of these Hindû stories will ensure them a cordial reception in their new dress. Fresh attention has been called of late to the remarkable character of these Fables, and the difference between these and *Æsop's* is in favor of the former, so far as good story-telling is concerned. The engravings were executed by the eminent engraver on wood, Alexander Anderson.

THE SAME. Large-paper edition, one hundred copies only, printed on hand-press, cloth extra. (Nearly ready.)

IV.

STORIES FROM OLD ENGLISH POETRY.

By Abby Sage Richardson. Illustrated. 1 vol. 16mo, \$1 50.

The stories have been told anew from the most famous and most beautiful of the classic dramas and poems in the English language. Shakespeare, Chaucer, Spenser, and other lesser poets have been drawn from, and there could be no more delightful introduction to the wealth of early English literature than is here given.

V.

FOUR, AND WHAT THEY DID. By Helen

C. Weeks, author of "Ainslee," "Grandpa's House," and "White and Red." With Illustrations. In 1 vol. 16mo, \$1 25.

Mrs. Weeks needs no introduction to those acquainted with the *Ainslee* Stories as one of the brightest, most entertaining, and most natural of writers for the young. These stories have their scenes laid chiefly in the West, and will be found very successful in catching the spirit of child life on the prairies and in new settlements.

VI.

POPULAR EDITION OF MOTHER GOOSE'S

Melodies for Children; or, Songs for the Nursery. A complete revised edition, with an account of the Goose or Vergoose Family. Illustrated by eighteen full-page illustrations. By Henry L. Stephens; ten pages of music, by Charles Moulton; and twelve smaller illustrations, by Gaston Fay. In 1 vol. 8vo. Price, in cloth, \$1 75.

PRATT'S
ASTRAL

OIL.

Remember that if a lamp filled with Pratt's Astral Oil is upset and broken, the contents will not explode or take fire. Remember, also, that it is not only the safest oil, but gives the best light. It costs but little more than the dangerous oils, and is safe, reliable, and good.

PETERS ON CHOLERA.

NOTES ON THE
ORIGIN, NATURE, PREVENTION,
AND
TREATMENT OF THE ASIATIC CHOLERA.

BY JOHN C. PETERS, M.D.

Second edition. With an Appendix. 12mo, cloth, \$1 50.

D. VAN NOSTRAND, Publisher,

23 Murray Street and 27 Warren Street.

Copies sent free by mail on receipt of price.

ARUNDEL SOCIETY.

This Society was founded in 1848, for promoting the knowledge of Art by copying and publishing

IMPORTANT WORKS OF ANCIENT
MASTERS.

Its publications are beautifully executed

CHROMO-LITHOGRAPHS,

Fac-similes of the originals, both in color and drawing, and are manufactured under the superintendence of well-known artists. The following are among the

MOST POPULAR SUBJECTS.

CHRIST AND MARY MAGDALENE IN
THE GARDEN. From a fresco by Fra Angelico, in
the Convent of St. Mark, at Florence. Size, 15x8½
inches. Price \$6 25.

THE ADORATION OF THE KINGS. From
a fresco by Pietro Perugino, at Cetta Della Pieve.
Size, 22x18½ inches. Price \$13 75.

ST. PETER DELIVERED FROM PRISON.
From a fresco by Raffaele, in the Stanza of the Vati-
can. Size, 28x19 inches. Price \$12 50.

THE CORONATION OF THE VIRGIN.
From a fresco by Fra Angelico, in the Convent of St.
Mark, at Florence. Size, 18x19 inches. Price \$10.

THE VIRGIN AND CHILD. From a fresco
by Fra Bartolomeo, now placed in the Convent of St.
Mark, at Florence. Size, 11x16½ inches. Price \$8.

THE ADORATION OF THE LAMB. From
the centre-panel of the Altar Piece painted by the
brothers Van Eyck, in the Cathedral of St. Bavon, at
Ghent. Size, 26x15½ inches. Price \$15 75.

The sizes above-given are the actual sizes of each picture, all of them being mounted on a heavy white card-board, so that when framed the white border can either be left as a margin, or not, at pleasure.

Any of the above pictures will be securely packed, free of charge, and sent by express, on receipt of advertised price.

POTT & AMERY,

Cooper Union, Fourth Avenue, New York.

SLAVE SONGS OF THE UNITED STATES.

A Unique Collection of Original Melodies—words and music—obtained among the negroes of the South; preceded by an account of these Songs, and an Essay on the Negro Dialect, as observed at Port Royal, by Prof. W. F. Allen, of the University of Wisconsin. Cloth, 8vo, price \$1 50.

Sent post-paid on receipt of price. Address
Publisher of "THE NATION,"
Box 6732, New York City.

JUST ISSUED.

PRICED CATALOGUE OF RARE

AND

VALUABLE BOOKS

Relating to Shakespeare and the Drama, American History, Biography, Poetry, etc., for sale by

T. H. MORRELL (Agent),

78 Nassau Street, New York,

(Between Fulton and John Streets.)

Catalogue sent free on application.

LONDON BOOKS.

PRICED CATALOGUE, No. 27,

OF

RARE,

STANDARD,

AND

VALUABLE ENGLISH AND FOREIGN BOOKS,

Now ready and will be sent free of charge to any address.

A fine lot of ENGRAVINGS just opened.

A. DENHAM & CO.,

IMPORTERS OF ENGLISH AND FOREIGN BOOKS,

17 MURRAY STREET

(Near Broadway),

New York.

THE "NATION" ABROAD.

Subscriptions and Advertisements for the *Nation* are received in Europe by the following

AGENTS:

GREAT BRITAIN AND THE COLONIES: George Street, 30
Cornhill, E.C., London.

FRANCE: Bowles Brothers & Co., 12 Rue de la Paix,
Paris.

SWITZERLAND: Vérosoff & Garrigues, Place Bel-Air,
Geneva.

ITALY: Furze Brothers & Co., 9 Piazza di Spagna,
Rome.

THE NATION PRESS.

The Proprietors of THE NATION PRESS give notice that they have established a Book, Pamphlet, Job, and Newspaper Printing-Office in this City, and are prepared to execute at moderate prices, for cash, the best of work in any and all of these branches.

For BOOKS they will furnish Electrotypes or Stereotype Plates, as desired, and will guaranty unusual accuracy in their preparation.

J. ROSS & CO., 27 Rose St., New York.

GAZZAM'S TREATISE

ON THE

BANKRUPT LAW.

SECOND EDITION JUST OUT.

For sale at all Law-Book Stores.

BOOK-BUYERS.

Send for Catalogue of INTERESTING, USEFUL, and
SCARCE BOOKS added to the Stock in hand of

FRANCIS EMMINS,

80 Nassau Street, New York.

